DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 300 647 CE 051 322

AUTHOR Dickinson, Katherine P.; And Others
TITLE Evaluation of the Effects of JTPA Performance Standards on Clients, Services, and Costs. Appendixes. Research Report No. 88-17.
INSTITUTION Berkeley Planning Associates, Calif.; SRI International, Menlo Park, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY National Commission for Employment Policy (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Sep 88
NOTE 141p.; For the body of the report, see CE 051 321; for the executive summary, see CE 051 320.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Client Characteristics (Human Services); Educational Policy; *Employment Services; *Evaluation Criteria; Federal Government; Government Role; Government School Relationship; Outcomes of Education; Policy Formation; *Program Costs; Program Improvement; Public Policy; *State Standards
IDENTIFIERS *Job Training Partnership Act 1982; *Performance Standards

ABSTRACT

These appendices accompany a study that was conducted to determine whether the state and federal performance standards for Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) programs have influenced Service Delivery Area (SDA) and service provider decisions about program design and implementation practices in ways that have affected the clients served, the types of services provided, and the costs of the services. The first appendix summarizes the study's four hypotheses. Case study findings and conclusions are listed in the second appendix. Averages of the independent variables used in the quantitative analysis are presented next. The fourth appendix is a chart that cross-references SDA goals, strategies for achieving performance goals, and performance standards in the 1986 program year. The final appendix deals with the study's data collection instruments. It covers the distribution of responses to the questionnaires and presents an outline of topics for on-site discussions. (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED300647

JTPA PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

Effects on Clients, Services, and Costs

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR EMPLOYMENT POLICY

Members of the National Commission for Employment Policy

GERTRUDE C. McDONALD, Chairman
Fremont, California

LEORA G. DAY
Boise, Idaho

HENRY A. DUFFY
Lithonia, Georgia

JOHN GARTLAND
Potomac, Maryland

MAX HUGEL
Windham, New Hampshire

DONALD W. JONES
Springfield, Missouri

J. MICHAEL LEVESQUE
Providence, Rhode Island

FRANK D. McDONALD
Thousand Oaks, California

VIRGINIA S. MILNER
Beverly Hills, California

JERRY NAYLOR
Agoura, California

A. WAYNE ROBERTS
Burlington, Vermont

JOHN A. ROCCO
Cherry Hill, New Jersey

WILLIAM M. TAYLOR
Jacksonville, Florida

JAMES W. WINCHESTER
Pass Christian, Mississippi

Section 106(f) of the Job Training Partnership Act states "The National Commission for Employment Policy shall ... evaluate the usefulness of ... standards as measures of desired performance, and evaluate the impact of ... standards (intended or otherwise) on the choice of who is served, what services are provided, and the cost of such services in service delivery areas."

EVALUATION OF THE EFFECTS OF JTPA PERFORMANCE STANDARDS ON CLIENTS, SERVICES, AND COSTS

Appendixes

Prepared by:

SRI International
Katherine P. Dickinson
Richard W. West

Berkeley Planning Associates
Deborah J. Kogan
David A. Drury
Marlene S. Franks
Laura Schlichtmann
Mary Vencill

Research Report No. 88-17

September 1988

National Commission for Employment Policy
1522 K Street N.W., Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 2000

This report was prepared under contract to the National Commission for Employment Policy. Any opinions or conclusions are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the opinions or policies of the Commission or any other agency of the United States Government.

List of Appendixes

Appendix A. Summary of Hypotheses

Appendix B. List of Case Study Findings and Conclusions

Appendix C. Averages of Independent Variables Used in Quantitative Analysis

Appendix D. SDA Strategies for Achieving Performance Goals

Appendix E. Data Collection Instruments

Appendix A.
Summary of Hypotheses

Appendix A

SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESES

I. Program-design elements affect clients, services, and costs.

A. Enrollment process and criteria affect characteristics of clients.

1. When outreach and intake are conducted by service providers, the providers' own preferences and the incentives created by contractual arrangements are likely to have a strong influence on whom is enrolled.

2. SDAs that establish priority groups for service are more likely to serve the hard to serve.

3. SDAs that have established tests and other criteria to exclude applicants are more likely to serve the more job ready.

4. SDAs that take all eligible applicants serve more disadvantaged.

5. SDAs that establish restrictive enrollment criteria have recruitment and expenditure difficulty.

B. The mix of program services affects clients, services, and costs.

1. SDAs that link basic skills training with employment-oriented programs will be more likely to serve less job-ready individuals.

2. SDAs that emphasize employer needs are more likely to enroll the less disadvantaged.

3. SDAs that have established YEC systems are more likely to enroll less job-ready youth.

4. SDAs that arrange joint funding of their programs with other programs and agencies will have lower reported costs.

C. Service-provider arrangements affect clients, services, and costs.

1. The type of service providers may have a strong influence on whom is enrolled and the type of program activity received, particularly in SDAs where they conduct intake activities.

2. Because of differences in orientation, the type of service provider may also affect the length of services provided and, therefore, the cost of services.

3. The use of performance-based contracts may lead service providers to select the more job-ready individuals because they will need to expend fewer resources and have a higher probability of receiving full payment by placing such individuals.

4. The use of performance-based contracts may reduce the length of stay in the program because the provider has an incentive to place individuals as soon as they are employable.

5. SDAs that vary the terms of performance-based contracts may serve more hard-to-serve individuals or provide more intensive program services.

6. Full payment for placements in jobs that last a specified length of time may result in longer and more expensive services.

7. Higher wage-rate goals may increase enrollment of more employable clients but may also increase incentives to provide longer training.

8. Reserving a large fraction of payment for placement and paying an additional amount for meeting a placement goal are expected to intensify the incentives to serve the more job ready and to provide the minimum training to achieve the outcome.

9. Performance-based contracts that specify entered-employment-rate goals and pay extra for meeting goals may lead providers to emphasize quick placements.

10. Incorporating goals for service to specific client groups in contracts may increase service to the hard to serve.

II. Federal performance standards affect clients, services, and costs.

A. Federal performance standards may affect the enrollment process.

1. Federal performance-standards policies may have the intended effect of not influencing the clients enrolled in JTPA programs.

2. SDAs may set up procedures to enroll the easier to serve because the adjustment models may not be adequate to hold SDAs harmless for enrolling the hard to serve.

3. Frequent changes in the DOL models may reduce confidence in the models and thereby lead SDAs to establish procedures to enroll the less hard to serve.

4. The specific mix of standards may lead SDAs to establish client-selection criteria to enroll those for whom the performance outcomes are more appropriate.

5. The level of standards may be set so high that SDAs cannot meet their standards without establishing criteria to select clients who are most job ready on the basis of characteristics not included in the model.

B. Federal performance-standards policies may influence the mix of program services offered.

1. Performance standards may have the intended effect of guiding SDAs to choose adult programs that are employment oriented, that train clients for high-quality jobs and that are cost-effective and to choose youth programs that provide an appropriate combination of employment-related programs and other-outcome-oriented programs that are cost-effective.

2. Termination-based performance standards may induce SDAs to provide programs with immediate employment as the goal, such as job-search assistance, rather than to provide more intensive services.

3. The positive-termination-rate standard may lead PICs to establish YEC systems that require minimal effort to achieve.

4. The cost-per-entered-employment standard may be set so low that more intensive interventions are not feasible, including the provision of basic skills training and the linking of several program services.

C. Performance standards may affect service-provider arrangements.

1. Performance standards may have the intended effect of leading SDAs to choose cost-effective service providers and to use with cost-minimizing contractual arrangements.

2. Performance standards may lead SDAs to use performance-based contracts to reduce the risk of not meeting cost standards.

3. Performance standards may lead SDAs to set terms of performance-based contracts to emphasize placement outcomes with low payments to meet the cost standards.

4. Performance standards may result in SDAs being unwilling to vary the terms of the performance-based contracts.

5. Performance standards may have made SDAs more conservative and risk averse in making service-provider decisions and thus less likely to use CBOs.

III. State performance-standards policies affect clients, services, and costs.

A. Additional standards may affect the elements of program design.

1. Equity-of-service standards may increase service to more disadvantaged groups.

2. Equity-of-service standards may increase the use of CBOs as service providers because of their commitment to serving more disadvantaged individuals.

3. Job-retention standards may create incentives to enroll more job-ready applicants but may increase length of stay because SDAs may need to provide more intensive services.

B. Procedures for adjusting standards may affect the elements of program design.

1. States that do not use adjustment models may increase the incentives of SDAs to serve the more job-ready candidates.

2. States that make adjustments beyond the model may increase the incentives of SDAs to serve the harder to serve or to provide longer term program services.

3. States that use adjustments based on State or regional data may more adequately adjust for their SDAs' circumstances.

C. The State's 6% policy may affect elements of program design.

1. State policies that link 6% awards to serving specific client groups will increase service to those groups.

2. Policies giving greater weight to specific standards will accentuate whatever design incentives are associated with those standards.

3. Policies that give more incentive payments for the extent to which standards are exceeded may accentuate the effects of performance standards.

IV. Other factors may influence program design.

A. Other Federal policies may affect program design.

1. The administrative cost limit creates a strong incentive for SDAs to use performance-based contracts because the total costs of such contracts are counted as training costs.

2. The limit on support costs and work experience affects the types of services offered, limiting work-experience programs and support services offered to participants.

3. The support costs limitation may increase the use of performance-based contracts.

4. JTPA reporting requirements for specific client characteristic may lead SDAs to increase service to those groups.

5. The costs of Federal reporting requirements may impose a record-keeping burden on SDAs, increasing the costs of the program.

6. Postprogram data collection requirements may impose additional burden and raise costs further.

B. PICs may affect elements of program design.

1. The extent of influence of the PICs depends on their involvement in JTPA programs.

2. PICs with more orientation toward serving local employers' needs compared with serving the needs of the disadvantaged may result in programs serving the more job ready and providing services such as OJT.

3. PICs may also accentuate the effects of performance standards if their members see meeting those standards and receiving incentive awards as a very important goal.

4. PICs that emphasize performance relative to past years' performance or relative to the national standards instead of relative to the adjusted standard may lead SDAs to serve the more job ready and provide less-intensive, less-expensive services.

C. Local elected officials may affect elements of program design.

1. The extent of the influence of the local elected officials depends on the extent of their involvement in the JTPA program.

2. The direction of the influence of the local elected officials depends on their orientation toward the needs of employers and participants.

3. The local elected officials may accentuate the influence of performance standards if they believe that meeting performance standards is an important goal.

D. Characteristics of the SDA may affect program design.

1. SDAs that were prime sponsors under CETA may be less likely to respond to performance standards in choosing client selection criteria, service mix, and service providers.

2. The staff's perceptions about the meaning and requirements of performance standards and the adjustment model may influence the effects of performance standards.

3. Poorly managed SDAs may find it difficult to meet performance standards without substantially altering the design of the program, perhaps by creaming among applicants and providing short-term, "quick-fix" training.

4. Directors' own attitudes may affect the types of clients enrolled and the services offered.

E. Local environment may affect program design.

1. The characteristics of the eligible population and of the local labor market will affect the types of individuals who apply to the program, the criteria used to select clients, and the types of programs deemed appropriate for local needs.

2. Geographic characteristics (e.g., rural locations) are likely to influence the ability of SDAs to provide specialized services and to limit the types of service providers that are available.

3. Local environmental factors are likely to directy affect clients, services, and costs.

a. The characteristics of the eligible population will influence who applies to and enrolls in the program.

b. Local areas with higher unemployment may have more job-ready applicants who may also stay longer in the program.

c. Program costs may be higher in rural areas because of transportation problems.

Appendix B.
List of Case Study Service Providers

Appendix B

LIST OF CASE STUDY SERVICE PROVIDERS

State	SDA	Name of Provider	Type of Provider	Types of Training Provided	Type of Contract	Target Population
CA	Kern/Inyo/Mono	Mexican American Opportunity Foundation	community-based organization	work experience or try out employment, remedial basic education, occupational classroom training	cost reimbursement	adults & youth; 1 project - h.s. dropouts; 1 project - limited English
CA	Kern/Inyo/Mono	Kern H.S. District	public educational institution	remedial basic education, occupational classroom training, work experience or try out employment, YEC curriculum	cost reimbursement	adults & youth; 2 projects dropout youth, 1 project in-school youth, 1 project disabled and hard to serve, 1 project limited English
CA	Kern/Inyo/Mono	Employers' Training Resource	SDA	on-the-job training, job-search assistance	N/A	adults & youth
CA	Los Angeles County	Industry Community Interface	community-based organization	work experience (with classroom training in basic skills)	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	offenders, welfare
CA	Los Angeles County	Chavez Institute	community-based organization	occupational classroom training, some on-the-job training	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	general (Hispanic)
CA	Los Angeles County	Community Bi-lingual Home Health Aid Program	community-based organization	occupational classroom training	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	welfare, Hispanic
CA	Los Angeles County	West San Gabriel Prime Agent (subcontracts out the training)	other public agency	occupational classroom training, on-the-job training	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	general, residents of area, covered by agreement
CA	Orange County	Orange County (not the SDA)	other public agency	intake, job-search assistance directly, referral to other programs	cost reimbursement	general, residents of area, covered by agreement

State	SDA	Name of Provider	Type of Provider	Training Provided	Type of Contract	Target Population
CA	Orange County	SER/Jobs for Progress, Inc.	community-based organization	classroom training, occupational classroom training	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	general, Hispanic
CA	Orange County	North Orange County Regional Occupational Program	public educational institution	classroom training, occupational classroom training	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	general
CA	Sonoma County	Sonoma County Office of Ed.	public educational institution	work experience or try out employment	fixed unit price with more than 50% holdback for placement	in-school (youth at risk)
CA	Sonoma County	Goodwill Industries	private nonprofit organization	on-the-job training	fixed unit price with more than 50% holdback for placement	adults & youth
CA	Sonoma County	California Human Dev. Corp. Center for Employment and Training (CET)	community-based organization	occupational classroom training	fixed unit price with more than 50% holdback for placement	adults & youth
MD	Baltimore City	Urban League	community-based organization	job-search assistance, intake and assessment	cost reimbursement	general
MD	Baltimore City	Homebuilders Assoc. of MD	private nonprofit organization	occupational classroom training	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	adults & youth, AFDC
MD	Baltimore City	ITT Career Training Center	private for-profit organization	occupational classroom training	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	adults & youth, AFDC
MD	Baltimore County	Eastside Occupational Training Center	public educational institution	occupational classroom training	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	adults & youth, AFDC
MD	Baltimore County	Catonsville Occupational Training Center	public educational institution	occupational classroom training	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	adults & youth, AFDC
MD	Baltimore County	Catonsville Community Career Center	public educational institution	remedial basic education, YEC curriculum	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	dropout youth
MD	Montgomery	Suburban Md. Building Industry Association	private nonprofit organization	occupational classroom training	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	adults and youth

State	SDA	Name of Provider	Type of Provider	Training Provided	Type of Contract	Target Population
MD	Montgomery	Montgomery County PIC	SDA	on-the-job training	N/A	adults & youth
MD	Montgomery	Temple School	private educational institution	occupational classroom training	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	primarily women 18+
MD	Prince George's	Prince George's Community College	public educational institution	occupational classroom training	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	primarily women 18+
MD	Prince George's	Melwood Horticultural Training Center, Inc.	private nonprofit organization	occupational classroom training, on-the-job training	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	mentally retarded
MD	Prince George's	Prince George's PIC, Inc.	SDA	on-the-job training	N/A	more adults than youth
MA	Boston	ABCD (Action for Boston Community Development)	community-based organization	remedial basic education, occupational classroom training, on-the-job training, work experience or try out employment, YEC curriculum, job-search assistance	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	adults & youth
MA	Boston	Women's Technical Institute	private educational institution (nonprofit)	occupational classroom training [non-traditional (grouped)]	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	women
MA	Boston	Boston Technical Center	private educational institution, community-based organization - subsidiary of EDIC	occupational classroom training	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	general
MA	Bristol County	SER/Jobs for Progress, Inc.	community-based organization	occupational classroom training, ESL (adult); YEC curriculum, job placement (youth)	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	limited English adults; at-risk youth
MA	Bristol County	Bristol Community College	public educational institution	remedial basic education occupational classroom training	cost reimbursement fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	adults & youth

State	SDA	Name of Provider	Type of Provider	Training Provided	Type of Contract	Target Population
MA	Bristol County	Joseph Villano Associates	private for-profit organization	occupational classroom training	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	adults & youth
MA	Franklin-Hampshire	Franklin-Hampshire Employment and Training Consortium	SDA	occupational classroom training, on-the job training, basic education, pre-employment training, work experience, tryout employment	N/A	general
MA	Brockton	Brockton Area PIC, Inc.	SDA	remedial basic education, occupational classroom training	N/A	general
MA	Brockton	IUE/The Work Connection	union	on-the-job training, supported work, with supervision by the program	cost reimbursement	(ex) offenders (alternative sentencing)
MA	Brockton	Brockton Public Schools	public educational institution	remedial basic education, work experience or try out employment, YEC curriculum	cost reimbursement	youth, dropouts and at risk
MO	Jefferson-Franklin	State Employment Service	other public agency	on-the-job training, job-search assistance, assessment	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	adults & youth
MO	Jefferson-Franklin	Jefferson College	public educational institution	occupational classroom training, job-search assistance, assessment	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	adults & youth
MO	Kansas City	Genesis	private educational institution (nonprofit)	remedial basic education & GED, YEC curriculum	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	youth, dropouts at risk
MO	Kansas City	Urban League	community-based organization	job-search assistance (Job Club)	fixed unit price with more than 50% holdback for placement	youth
MO	Kansas City	Missouri Division of Employment Security	other public agency	on-the-job training, job-search assistance, customized training	fixed unit price with more than 50% holdback for placement	general

State	SDA	Name of Provider	Type of Provider	Training Provided	Type of Contract	Target Population
MO	Bates-Vernon	State Dept. of Education	public educational institution	remedial basic education, occupational classroom training, (individual referral)	cost reimbursement (reimbursement for instructional costs)	adults & youth
MO	Bates-Vernon	Missouri Valley Human Resources Development Corporation Subsidiary of AFL-CIO	union	remedial basic education, occupational classroom training, on-the-job training, work experience or try out employment, YEC curriculum, job-search assistance	fixed unit price with more than 50% holdback for placement	adults & youth
MO	Bates-Vernon	West Central Missouri RDC	community-based organization	remedial basic education, occupational classroom training, on-the-job training, work experience or try out employment, YEC curriculum, job-search assistance	fixed unit price with more than 50% holdback for placement	adults & youth
MO	Butler-Wright	S. Central Missouri Economic Opportunity Corporation	community-based organization	YEC curriculum, on-the-job training, job-search assistance	cost reimbursement fixed unit price with more than 50% holdback for placement	youth & adults
MO	Butler-Wright	State Dept. of Elementary & Secondary Education	public educational institution	occupational classroom training (remedial basic ed. under 8% funds)	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	youth & adults
MO	Butler-Wright	Easter Seal Society	private nonprofit organization	job-search assistance, on-the-job training	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	handicapped adults
NM	Albuquerque	Career Services for the Handicapped	other public agency	on-the-job training, job-search assistance-counseling	cost reimbursement	adults with disabilities
NM	Albuquerque	Youth Development Inc.	private organization nonprofit	remedial basic education, work experience or try out employment, YEC curriculum	cost reimbursement	dropouts and at risk in school

State	SDA	Name of Provider	Type of Provider	Training Provided	Type of Contract	Target Population
NM	Albuquerque	Work Unlimited	other public agency (closely linked with SDA)	remedial basic education, occupational classroom training, on-the-job training, job-search assistance	cost reimbursement (really a financial agreement, not a contract)	adults and youth
NM	Balance of State	SER-Jobs for Progress	community-based organization	on-the-job training only and only in Santa Fe County	cost reimbursement	adults and youth - Hispanic focus
NM	Balance of State	State Dept. of Education	public educational institution	remedial basic education, work experience or try out employment	cost reimbursement	disabled youth, mostly mentally retarded
NM	Balance of State	Div. of Employment Security	other public agency linked with SDA	remedial basic education, occupational classroom training, on-the-job training, work experience or try out employment, YEC curriculum, job-search assistance	cost reimbursement	general
NY	Saratoga	Greater Saratoga Chamber of Commerce	private nonprofit organization	on-the-job training	cost reimbursement	adults & youth
NY	Saratoga	Saratoga/Warren BOCES	public educational institution	occupational classroom training	cost reimbursement	adults & youth
NY	Saratoga	Worldwide Educational Services	private for-profit educational institution	occupational classroom training	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement (30%)	primarily women 18+
NY	SWNY Partnership (Alleghany)	Jamestown Boys' and Girls' Club	private nonprofit organization	YEC curriculum, job-search assistance	fixed unit price with more than 50% holdback for placement	out-of-school youth (dropouts)
NY	SWNY Partnership (Alleghany)	(Cattaragus County) Ocean School District	public educational institution	occupational classroom training	cost reimbursement	adults & youth
NY	Syracuse	Educational Opportunity Center	other public agency (EOC is nonprofit corp., but is part of SUNY, Div. of Special Programs)	remedial basic education	cost reimbursement	adults (general)

State	SDA	Name of Provider	Type of Provider	Training Provided	Type of Contract	Target Population
NY	Syracuse	Syracuse City School District	public educational institution	occupational classroom training	fixed unit price with more than 50% holdback for placement	adults & youth
NY	Syracuse	Empire Vision	other - private employer	on-the-job training	Pays half salary for time in training: placement expected but not required.	adults
NY	Yonkers	Yonkers Rehab. Center, Inc.	community-based organization	other - transitional supported employment	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement (20%)	mentally ill
NY	Yonkers	Yonkers PIC	SDA	on-the-job training	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement (20%)	adults & youth
NY	Yonkers	Youth Services Agency	other public agency	YEC curriculum (also incorporates work experience or try out employment)	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement (20%)	teenage dropouts
NC	Centralina	North Carolina Dept. of Labor	other public agency	on-the-job training adult/youth	cost reimbursement	general
NC	Centralina	Mitchell Community College	public educational institution	occupational classroom training, also individual referral, classroom training - basic skills assessment	cost reimbursement	general
NC	Centralina	Employment Security Commission	other public agency	intake eligibility, on-the-job training, individual referral	cost reimbursement	general
NC	Gaston County	Gaston College	public educational institution	classroom training, basic skills, occupational classroom training, accept individual referrals	cost reimbursement	general
		County Schools	public educational institution	pre-emp./work maturity	cost reimbursement	in-school youth
NC	Gaston County	Gaston-Lincoln Area Mental Health	other public agency	transitional and supported employment	cost reimbursement	mentally ill

State	SDA	Name of Provider	Type of Provider	Training Provided	Type of Contract	Target Population
NC	Winston-Salem	SDA	SDA	occupational classroom training, on-the-job training, job-search assistance, YEC curriculum, work experience or try out employment	N/A	in-school youth, youth & adults
NC	Winston-Salem	Experiment in Self-Reliance	community-based organization	remedial basic education	cost reimbursement	youth & adults
NC	Winston-Salem	Urban League of Winston-Salem	community-based organization	occupational classroom training	cost reimbursement	women, youth & adults
NC	Wake-Johnston	SDA	SDA	on-the-job training, job-search assistance	N/A	adults & youth
NC	Wake-Johnston	Association for Retarded Citizens	private nonprofit organization	on-the-job training	cost reimbursement	mentally retarded
NC	Wake-Johnston	Wake County Schools	public educational institution	YEC curriculum	cost reimbursement	in-school youth, jrs. & srs. not going to college
OH	Cleveland	Cleveland Hometown Program	community-based organization	job-search assistance	fixed unit price with more than 50% holdback for placement	youth & adults
OH	Cleveland	ITT Career Center	private for-profit organization	intake & assessment	cost reimbursement	general
OH	Cleveland	Fenix Circle Enterprises	private for-profit organization	remedial basic education, occupational classroom training	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	youth
OH	Crawford/Wyandot	Tri-Rivers Vocational School	public educational institution	pre-employment, try out employment, tutoring in basic skills	cost reimbursement	in-school youth
OH	Crawford/Wyandot	Crawford County Office of the SDA	SDA	basic education remediation, job-search assistance, on-the-job training, referral to individual classroom training, occupational classroom training	N/A	general, residents of Crawford County
OH	Southeast Ohio (Belmont-Washington)	Employment Service	other public agency	eligibility determination	cost reimbursement	general

State	SDA	Name of Provider	Type of Provider	Training Provided	Type of Contract	Target Population
OH	Southeast Ohio (Belmont-Washington)	Guernsy County	other public agency	on-the-job training, referral to individual classroom training, training	cost reimbursement	general, residents of county
OH	Southeast Ohio (Belmont-Washington)	Noble County Office CAP Agency	community-based organization	on-the-job training, referral to individual classroom training, occupational classroom training	cost reimbursement	general, residents of county
OH	Southeast Ohio (Belmont-Washington)	Belmont County	community-based organization	on-the-job training, referral to individual classroom training	cost reimbursement	general, residents of county
OH	Trumbull County	Trumbull Business College	private (for-profit) educational institution	occupational classroom training	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	adults & youth
OH	Trumbull County	ATES Technical Institute	private (nonprofit) educational institution	occupational classroom training	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	adults & youth
OH	Trumbull County	Trumbull County Joint Vocational School	public educational institution	occupational classroom training, remedial basic education	fixed unit price with less than 50% holdback for placement	adults & youth

Appendix C.
Averages of Independent Variables Used in Quantitative Analysis

Appendix C

AVERAGES OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES USED IN QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

State Policies	Averages	
Use of model (number of standards for which model used)	6.61	
Whether adjustment procedures specified in policy (yes = 1, no = 0)	.44	
Emphasis on exceeding standards in 6% policy [Index of four State policies: Percentage of incentives received for marginally exceeding standards (weight = -.0098). Whether cap performance (weight = 0.72). Number of standards that must be exceeded (weight = 0.03).]	-.25	
Use of 6% for hard to serve (Whether the State set aside a pool of 6% funds for serving hard to serve, whether the State requires a portion of 6% funds to be used for hard to serve, or whether 6% funds are exempted from performance standards if they are used for the hard to serve.)	.37	
Whether expenditure rates incorporated into 6% award (yes = 1, no = 0)	.33	
	Adults	Youth
State policy for serving client group (Whether the State established a policy for serving the client group, whether service to the group is integrated into calculating incentive funds, or whether the client group is identified as a priority group.)	.37	
Welfare recipients	.45	.45
Dropouts	.32	.35
In school	--	.04
Minorities	.34	.37
Females	.23	.23
Other barriers to employment	.42	.42
Over 55 years old	.17	--

Incentive Weight on Standards (%)	Adults	Youth
Adults		
Entered-employment rate	12.3%	--
Wage at placement	10.6	--
Cost per entered employment	18.1	--
Welfare entered-employment rate	14.6	--
Youth		
Entered-employment rate	--	18.6%
Positive-termination rate	--	9.7
Cost per positive termination	--	16.1

PIC and LEO Characteristics	Average
(Not = 1, Somewhat = 2, Quite = 3, Extremely = 4)	
PIC influence on program design	2.81
PIC influence in contracting	2.78
LEO influence on program design	2.09
LEO influence in contracting	2.13
PIC and LEO concern about performance	
-- Relative to standard set by State	2.98
-- Relative to other criteria	2.51
PIC and LEO concern about expending funds	2.85

Local Environment	
Unemployment rate (PY 86)	7.43
Percentage of families with incomes below poverty level (1980)	9.73

SDA Procedures (Director Sample)	Adults	Youths
Enrollment criteria (proportion of activities for which criteria used):		
No specific criteria	.18	.18
Education or basic skills criteria	.40	.43
Judged more likely to complete program	.36	.31
Previous work history	.18	.28
Referred from other agency	.18	.26

	Average
Percentage of OJT participants selected first by employer	16.3

Whether SDA established procedures to recruit and enroll client group (yes = 1, no = 0):	Adults	Youth
Welfare recipients	.75	.58
Dropouts	.52	.77
In school	--	.69
Minorities	.39	.38
Other barriers to employment	.68	.69
Ages 14 to 15	--	.30
Ages 55 and older	--	--

SDA Procedures (MIS Sample)	Average
Percentage of participants receiving funding from other programs or other JTPA sources	27.4
Expenditures in other JTPA programs as percentage of Title II-A 78% expenditures	58.5
Percentage of expenditures in supportive services	10.2
Proportion of program activities provided by	
SDA itself	.42
Public schools (including community college)	.59
Employment service and other government agencies	.20
Community-based organization	.45
For-profit organization	.31

	Adults	Youth
Percentage of expenditures in performance-based contracts	24.2%	23.5%
Terms of performance-based contracts (weighted by percentage of expenditures in performance-based contracts)		
Wage rate	103.2	--
Proportion of full payment for placement outcomes	11.8	--
Whether terms of performance-based contracts vary	22.0	--

Percentage of participants or terminees participating in program activities:	Adults	Youth
Job-search assistance (including pre-employment/work maturity)	24.4%	23.4%
Basic skills	7.0	10.4
Classroom training in occupational skills	31.8	16.8
OJT	30.0	14.5
Work experience	2.9	12.1
Try out employment	--	16.1
Other	3.9	6.4

Appendix D.
SDA Strategies for Achieving Performance Goals

Appendix D

SDA STRATEGIES FOR ACHIEVING PERFORMANCE GOALS

SDA Goals		SDA Strategies for Achieving Performance Goals			SDA Performance in PY 86		
Performance	Other	Service Design	Client Targeting Goals	Management Practices	Performance as % of Standard (Averaged across standards)	Award as % of 78% Allocation	Standards Missed
SDA #1 Exceed by 10% to get maximum $	Meet participant needs	Balance long-term services for some with direct job placement for large numbers.	Decide when to enroll participants in other programs to maximize outputs.	Build in high expectation in performance-based contracts. Negotiate unit costs based on line item budget to ensure cost-effectiveness. Vary wage expectations by occupational training area to maximize the level of each.	2.15	.064	--
SDA #2 Exceed (pride, some $)	Look good to rest of world	Design low-cost services. Increase OJTs (also a response to the economy). In-school YECs. Assure success by design of components.		Don't enroll OJT client until begins work. Don't enroll offenders until placed. Retain responsibility for placement, though training contractors help.	1.96	.109	--
SDA #3 Exceed		Expand individual referrals for classroom training. Don't do OJTs in tight labor market.		Monthly management meetings. Intensive review of client level problems and corrective action. Recent change from maximizing numbers to increasing intensity of services.	1.88	.054	--

Appendix D (continued)

SDA Goals		SDA Strategies for Achieving Performance Goals			SDA Performance in PY 86		
Performance	Other	Service Design	Client Targeting Goals	Management Practices	Performance as % of Standard (Averaged across standards)	Award as % of 78% Allocation	Standards Missed
SDA #4 Exceed ++ ($, be #1 in State, which means largest award)	Stretch $ to serve more people	Heavy emphasis on services of short duration such as job club, 4-week OJTs, 4-hour YECs; 100% fixed-unit-price, paid at placement.	Freeze enrollments for all but targeted groups in incentive formula when necessary.	Split-year strategy: first "run like crazy" to take care of performance goals, then hope they have enough time and money left over to operate a service program for part of the year.	1.81	.098	--
SDA #5 Meet ($)	Find jobs, meet needs	Increased OJT (PIC likes).		Planned versus actual in evaluation reports (not including standards measures). Discontinue nonperformers in subsequent year. Adopted YECs done by another SDA.	1.74	.143	--
SDA #6 Meet (stay out of trouble)	Comply with State mandates	Customized training for State corrections department (high wage).	Specialized contracts for handicapped youths; use of CBOs to reach minorities.	Rely on proven providers and experiment only with small amounts of money.	1.74	.021	--
SDA #7 Exceed or meet		Minimal job-search assistance program, enrolling only those who succeed (to improve wage outcomes, enroll only those who get jobs above a fixed wage minimum).	Refer high-risk clients to job-search assistance. Contracts with CBOs to serve dropouts and handicapped.	Build requirements into contracts and monitor heavily.	1.68	.034	AWP

Appendix D [continued]

SDA Goals		SDA Strategies for Achieving Performance Goals			SDA Performance in PY 86		
Performance	Other	Service Design	Client Targeting Goals	Management Practices	Performance as % of Standard (Averaged across standards)	Award as % of 78% Allocation	Standards Missed
SDA #8 Meet (pride, PR, will be $)	More jobs, less welfare, help employers	Develop YECs to attain YPTR. Use SVP guidelines to determine duration of training.		Guidelines for cost-reimbursement contracts above standards level. Track performance and push providers; discontinue those that don't perform.	1.66	?	--
SDA #9 Exceed ($, declining allocation)	Stretch $ to serve more people			Choose providers based on exceeding in the past and ability to deliver low-cost services (multiple funding sources). Performance-based contract with 40% holdback for placement at specified minimum wage. Centralized intake. They push providers, who wonder if it's worth it.	1.59	.098	--
SDA #10 Exceed all standards (PIC goal)	Leverage other funding sources			Continuity of service providers with proven track record, with renewal of contracts contingent on continued high performance. Performance-based contracts with 20% holdback for training-related placement at specified wage. Careful planning to "build" contract requirements that translate into success.	1.57	.070	--

Appendix D [continued]

SDA Goals		SDA Strategies for Achieving Performance Goals			SDA Performance in PY 86		
Performance	Other	Service Design	Client Targeting Goals	Management Practices	Performance as % of Standard (Averaged across standards)	Award as % of 78% Allocation	Standards Missed
SDA #11 Meet (stay out of trouble)	PIC: produce trained workforce	Find ways to work with clients till they ARE ready. Sliding scale for OJTs. Sequence classroom and OJT.	Focus on serving adults (the need is greater).	If wage or cost look marginal, cream. Pay larger percentage of FUP for higher wages.	1.45	.033	--
SDA #12 Exceed+ ($, pride)	Be one of the best, stretch $	Provide limited support services (save money to serve more people). Leverage other funds (e.g., education) for training.		Pass along standards to counties, monitor. Don't allow OJTs under $4.25.	1.44	.098	--
SDA #13 Exceed ($, declining allocation)	(success = exceeding the standards)			100% fixed-unit-price contracting (payment contingent on average wage rather than minimum). Pass along incentive funds to providers based on their model-adjusted performance. Use standards as part of management strategy.	1.39	.043	--
SDA #14 Exceed ($ declining allocation)	Meet varied needs at low cost	YECs as a safety net. Provide varied services to meet needs; employer outreach to improve wage.	Overrecruit, allow unmotivated to fall out. Emphasize screening, (assessment contract with Goodwill).	Expect the most that's reasonable from contractors, given history & resources.	1.37	.133	--

Appendix D [continued]

SDA Goals		SDA Strategies for Achieving Performance Goals			SDA Performance in PY 86		
Performance	Other	Service Design	Client Targeting Goals	Management Practices	Performance as % of Standard (Averaged across standards)	Award as % of 78% Allocation	Standards Missed
SDA #15 Meet all, exceed one ($)	Prove can do well, stay out of trouble	Standards have forced them to run 2-tier program in which white males go to OJT and get good wages, others go to classroom. 6% money for adult remediation.	Overdo outreach so that applicants have to be persistent.	Run a "tight ship", don't waste taxpayer money, differentiate from CETA. $500 bonus to staff if meet or exceed standards.	1.34	?	--
SDA #16 Meet (pride)	Meet employer needs	Fund cheaper courses. Shorter OJTs. Do remediation before clients are enrolled (with non-Title II-A 78% funding).		Push for higher wage jobs. To improve cost, use cheaper providers.	1.33	.031	--
SDA #17 Maximize award ($)	PIC: keep improving, low cost			Nominally competitive RFP process, attrition of lowest performers; performance-based contract for for-profit providers, cost-reimbursed for schools;	1.32	.039	--

Appendix D [continued]

SDA Goals		SDA Strategies for Achieving Performance Goals			SDA Performance in PY 86		
Performance	Other	Service Design	Client Targeting Goals	Management Practices	Performance as % of Standard (Averaged across standards)	Award as % of 78% Allocation	Standards Missed
SDA #18 Exceed ($) or meet (pride)	Serve the disadvantaged	To attain youth standards, including cost: reduce in-school programming and substitute a quick and inexpensive "Life Skills" training (motivated solely by standards and adopted with considerable reluctance by a staff that would rather be delivering significant services).			1.29	.045	--
SDA #19 Exceed ($, declining allocation)	Earn respect; Serve needy, employers	When difficulty serving most in need, increase the emphasis on counseling.		SDA has backup responsibility for placement. All cost-reimbursement contracts. Many services provided in-house in comprehensive center. Contract out services to hard-to-serve groups.	1.26	.104	--
SDA #20 Meet	Offer range of services to meet needs	Offer a mix of services; put pressure on OJT and job search to operate cheaply so they can serve most in need with more intensive services.	Assess clients carefully to ensure appropriate match of training.	Follow individual participants to make sure they succeed or are referred to another component.	1.25	.041	--

Appendix D [continued]

SDA Goals		SDA Strategies for Achieving Performance Goals			SDA Performance in PY 86		
Performance	Other	Service Design	Client Targeting Goals	Management Practices	Performance as % of Standard (Averaged across standards)	Award as % of 78% Allocation	Standards Missed
SDA #21 Meet (get $ & stay out of trouble)	Adjust to changing econ, population	Refine training to meet employer needs. Establish YECs. Refuse to do "quick & dirty".	New strategies for working with more disadvantaged.	Attention to the assessment and matching process. Insist on higher minimum wage for OJT. Women in (high wage) non-traditional occupations. Involve staff in comprehensive planning.	1.23	.044	CEE
SDA #22 Marginally exceed ($)	Coordinate; train for good jobs	Do what they are doing anyway. Leverage funds through contracts with schools and other providers with multiple funding sources.		Try to increase minimum specified wage at entry to $6.00. Move toward performance-based contracting.	1.23	.044	AEER
SDA #23 Exceed the standards slightly	To deliver appropriate training	Use customized training (which can include OJT, as long as it's in a "new" job).		Design contract requirements so that they include a significant margin for error.	1.22	.043	--
SDA #24 Meet (can't spend $)		Keep an eye on wages, occupations, and training duration.	Move slowly and be conservative about whom you accept.	Use standards as "negotiating tool" with contractors to push for lower costs. Fixed-unit-price contracts (have raised costs as providers build in cushion).	1.16	.052	--

Appendix D [continued]

SDA Goals		SDA Strategies for Achieving Performance Goals			SDA Performance in PY 86		
Performance	Other	Service Design	Client Targeting Goals	Management Practices	Performance as % of Standard (Averaged across standards)	Award as % of 78% Allocation	Standards Missed
SDA #25 Meet	Serve most in need	Leverage workfare funds. Maximize linkages. Develop sound YECs.	Enroll hardest in 8% programs.	Cost-reimbursement contracts. "Bookkeeping" response to maximizing measured performance, claim credit where it's due. Enroll third day.	1.15	.047	(AWP, YPTR) but met by State's definition (within tolerance range)
SDA #26 Exceed by 10% ($ and pride)			Dropped emphasis on 14-15 year olds because "the model hurt them".	Pass along requirements (higher than standards) to contractors, push hard and monitor continually (they are locked in to some large contractors that would be difficult to replace). Build in "standards + 10%" levels in their MIS to track performance.	1.12	.053	C/PT
SDA #27 Meet (money hard to spend)	Placements			Two-year contracts, with performance assessed after one year, shake out providers who aren't placement oriented. Increasingly strict provisions of performance-based contracts.	1.11	.000	YEER (badly)

Appendix D [continued]

SDA Goals		SDA Strategies for Achieving Performance Goals			SDA Performance in PY 86		
Performance	Other	Service Design	Client Targeting Goals	Management Practices	Performance as % of Standard (Averaged across standards)	Award as % of 78% Allocation	Standards Missed
SDA #28 Meet ($ for meeting is significant)	Continue to operate good program	Expecting trouble with youth and will need to meet 7 of 7 to qualify, so they are "reluctantly" moving toward adopting YECs. Also have deleted expensive training.		Try NOT to let standards drive the program; operate "business as usual" and use standards as a mechanism for quality control after the fact.	1.09	.063	YEER, YPTR
SDA #29 Exceed or meet (pride)	Serve the local community			Pass along full risk to contractors via fixed-unit-price contracts with payment 100% contingent on placement at a given minimum wage level, with higher payment for higher wage. Then work cooperatively with service providers to achieve goals (hired a PR/outreach/job development specialist to supplement).	1.06	.018	C/EE
SDA #30 Meet (get out of trouble)	Quality program meeting local needs	OJT overperform to cushion against riskier contracts. If AC/EE slips, limit time in program to 6 months, then 4. Don't do job club or "money wasters".	Accept all eligible applicants.	Expand group of providers, keep an eye on those that have failed. Emphasis on $5.75 wage (may have cost placements).	.093	0	AEER C/EE YEER C/PT

Appendix E.
Data Collection Instruments

CONTENTS

Distribution of Responses to Questionnaires E-2

Introduction E-3

Distribution of Responses to SDA Director Questionnaire . . E-5

Average Responses on Fiscal/MIS Questionnaire E-32

Distribution of Answers on State Performance Standards Coding Form E-39

Outline of Topics for On-Site Discussions E-50

State Staff Qualitative Analysis. E-51

SDA Respondents Qualitative Analysis. E-50

PIC Representative Qualitative Analysis E-76

Service Providers Qualitative Analysis. E-80

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES

INTRODUCTION

Three data collection instruments were developed for the quantitative evaluation of the effects of JTPA performance standards on the types of clients served, the types of services offered and the costs of those services.

The first data collection instrument is the SDA director questionnaire. This questionnaire was mailed to the directors of all 610 SDAs in the United States. Telephone interviews were attempted for all SDA directors that failed to respond to the mail survey. A total of 530 SDAs provided responses to either the mail or telephone director questionnaires (a 87% response rate).

The second data collection instrument is the fiscal/MIS questionnaire, which was mailed to all SDAs along with the director questionnaire. Because this questionnaire was not amenable to telephone interviewing, SDAs that did not return the questionnaire were requested to do so by telephone, but no attempt was made to get the responses over the telephone. A total of 454 SDAs (a 74% response rate) provided responses to the fiscal/MIS questionnaire.

The third data collection instrument is the State performance-standards coding form. Copies of state policies related to performance standards were obtained from all states and the District of Columbia. These policies were then coded by project staff using the coding form.

This appendix presents 3 data collection instruments. The distribution of the responses to the 3 data collection instruments have been incorporated into copies of the instruments themselves. In addition, a table is appended to the fiscal/MIS questionnaire providing average values of some expenditure percentages, such as the percentage of total expenditures classified as

administrative expenditures. These are averages of the percentages, not percentages based on the averages included in the questionnaire.

The distributions presented are calculated for the SDAs that provided valid responses to each item. In cases where questions pertain to only a subset of SDAs or states, the distributions represent the percentage of SDAs with valid responses that responded to each category. To aid the reader in interpreting these responses, we indicate the size of the sample (denoted as n) providing valid responses for questions pertaining to a subset of SDAs or states. (In some cases, respondents did not respond to questions asked of them, so the sample sizes for related questions vary due to missing data.)

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO SDA DIRECTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

A. PIC Characteristics

A1. In your opinion, how important is each of the following to the PIC? (n = 529)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

	HOW IMPORTANT TO THE PIC			
	Not	Somewhat	Quite	Extremely
a. Whether the SDA meets the needs of local employers	1 (0.0%)	2 (5.3%)	3 (31.2%)	4 (63.5%)
b. Whether the SDA meets the needs of those who are eligible for JTPA	1 (0.2%)	2 (5.9%)	3 (32.7%)	4 (61.2%)
c. Performance relative to SDA's standards, set by the state	1 (1.3%)	2 (18.1%)	3 (46.0%)	4 (34.6%)
d. Performance relative to that of other SDAs in the state	1 (12.7%)	2 (41.5%)	3 (33.2%)	4 (12.7%)
e. Performance relative to the national standards	1 (13.1%)	2 (41.7%)	3 (31.9%)	4 (13.3%)
f. Performance this year relative to previous years' performance	1 (2.1%)	2 (27.3%)	3 (48.0%)	4 (22.6%)
g. Expending the SDA's full allocation of funds	1 (5.6%)	2 (27.8%)	3 (41.2%)	4 (25.5%)

A2. How influential would you say the PIC is with regard to each of the following aspects of the JTPA program in your SDA? (n = 527)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

	HOW INFLUENTIAL THE PIC IS ABOUT EACH ASPECT			
	Not	Somewhat	Quite	Extremely
a. The types of clients who are enrolled in the programs	1 (11.4%)	2 (42.3%)	3 (32.0%)	4 (14.3%)
b. The types of program services that are offered	1 (0.9%)	2 (18.3%)	3 (39.5%	4 (41.2%)
c. The development of Youth Employment Competencies (YECs)	1 (6.8%)	2 (35.1%)	3 (34.5%	4 (23.5%)
d. The type(s) of contracts used	1 (13.3%)	2 (36.6%)	3 (27.8%	4 (22.3%)
e. The terms of the contracts	1 (16.7%)	2 (37.5%)	3 (28.9%	4 (16.9%)
f. The selection of service providers	1 (4.7%)	2 (12.1%)	3 (31.8%	4 (51.3%)

B. Characteristics of the Local Elected Official(s)

B1. In your opinion, how important is each of the following to the local elected official(s)? (n = 523)

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

	HOW IMPORTANT TO THE LOCAL ELECTED OFFICIAL(S):			
	Not	Somewhat	Quite	Extremely
a. Whether the SDA meets the needs of local employers	1 (2.5%)	2 (22.5%)	3 (41.2%)	4 (33.8%)
b. Whether the SDA meets the needs of those who are eligible for JTPA	1 (1.5%)	2 (15.8%)	3 (39.8%)	4 (42.9%)
c. Performance relative SDA's standards, set by the state	1 (5.9%)	2 (28.5%)	3 (42.8%)	4 (22.8%)
d. Performance relative to that of other SDAs in the state	1 (16.7%)	2 (43.1%)	3 (32.0%)	4 (8.2%)
e. Performance relative to the national standards	1 (18.4%)	2 (43.8%)	3 (29.1%)	4 (8.8%)
f. Performance this year relative to previous years' performance	1 (6.9%)	2 (33.7%)	3 (42.9%)	4 (16.6%)
g. Expending the SDA's full allocation of funds	1 (7.1%)	2 (29.7%)	3 (38.3%)	4 (24.9%)

B2. How influential would you say the local elected official(s) is/are with regard to each of the following aspects of the JTPA program in your SDA? (n = 525)

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

	HOW INFLUENTIAL THE LOCAL ELECTED OFFICIAL(S) IS/ARE ABOUT EACH ASPECT:			
	Not	Somewhat	Quite	Extremely
a. The types of clients who are enrolled in the programs	1 (22.8%)	2 (42.8%)	3 (25.8%)	4 (8.6%)
b. The types of program services that are offered	1 (15.3%)	2 (43.8%)	3 (27.7%)	4 (13.2%)
c. The development of Youth Employment Competencies (YECs)	1 (48.8%)	2 (37.0%)	3 (9.8%)	4 (4.4%)
d. The type(s) of contracts used	1 (33.3%)	2 (37.4%)	3 (19.5%)	4 (9.8%)
e. The terms of the contracts	1 (37.3%)	2 (34.6%)	3 (18.2%)	4 (9.9%)
f. The selection of service providers	1 (24.3%)	2 (35.9%)	3 (22.4%)	4 (17.4%)

C. Performance Standards Issues

C1. How influential would you say the performance standards are with regard to each of the following aspects of the JTPA program in your SDA? (n = 529)

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

	HOW INFLUENTIAL THE PERFORMANCE STANDARDS ARE ABOUT EACH ASPECT:			
	Not	Somewhat	Quite	Extremely
a. The types of clients who are enrolled in the programs	1 (10.6%)	2 (33.6%)	3 (34.7%)	4 (21.1%)
b. The types of program services that are offered	1 (5.3%)	2 (24.6%)	3 (47.6%)	4 (22.5%)
c. The development of Youth Employment Competencies (YECs)	1 (9.3%)	2 (24.8%)	3 (39.5%)	4 (26.5%)
d. The type(s) of contracts used	1 (15.2%)	2 (25.8%)	3 (33.7%)	4 (25.4%)
e. The terms of the contracts	1 (14.0%)	2 (21.6%)	3 (36.8%)	4 (27.5%)
f. The selection of service providers	1 (10.4%)	2 (19.1%)	3 (39.5%)	4 (31.0%)

C2. Overall, how influential is each of the SDA's performance standards in the design of JTPA programs in your SDA? (n = 525)

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

	HOW INFLUENTIAL IS EACH STANDARD:			
	Not	Somewhat	Quite	Extremely
a. Adult entered-employment rate	1 (1.7%)	2 (14.5%)	3 (42.3%)	4 (41.5%)
b. Adult wage at placement	1 (2.9%)	2 (21.9%)	3 (44.5%)	4 (30.7%)
c. Adult cost per entered employment	1 (3.0%)	2 (23.2%)	3 (42.5%)	4 (31.2%)
d. Youth entered-employment rate	1 (3.4%)	2 (21.0%)	3 (44.5%)	4 (31.1%)
e. Youth positive-termination rate	1 (1.3%)	2 (15.6%)	3 (45.7%)	4 (37.3%)
f. Youth cost per positive termination	1 (2.9%)	2 (25.1%)	3 (42.7%)	4 (29.3%)
g. Welfare entered-employment rate	1 (2.9%)	2 (21.3%)	3 (43.1%)	4 (32.8%)
h. Additional state standards *(PLEASE SPECIFY:)*				
_____	1 (5.7%)	2 (14.2%)	3 (42.5%)	4 (37.7%)
_____	1 (6.8%)	2 (11.4%)	3 (45.5%)	4 (36.4%)

C.1 Performance Standards Issues (continued)

C3. Are any of the DOL models used in determining any of your SDA's performance standards? (n = 501)

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

	Yes	1	(78.0%)
PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION C13, PAGE 7 <--	No	2	(22.0%)

C4. How well does each model adjust for your SDA's circumstances? (n = 386)

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

Model	ADJUSTMENTS MODEL MAKES FOR YOUR SDA'S CIRCUMSTANCES: Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Doesn't Apply: Model Not Used
a. Adult entered-employment rate	1 (6.2%)	2 (28.0%)	3 (56.2%)	4 (8.3%)	0 (1.3%)
b. Adult wage at placement	1 (18.0%)	2 (30.4%)	3 (43.3%)	4 (6.4%)	0 (1.8%)
c. Adult cost per entered employment	1 (10.1%)	2 (24.7%)	3 (53.1%)	4 (10.1%)	0 (2.1%)
d. Youth entered-employment rate	1 (13.1%)	2 (31.0%)	3 (47.7%)	4 (5.6%)	0 (2.6%)
e. Youth positive-termination rate	1 (15.4%)	2 (31.4%)	3 (46.3%)	4 (4.6%)	0 (2.3%)
f. Youth cost per positive termination	1 (14.4%)	2 (28.0%)	3 (47.8%)	4 (7.2%)	0 (2.6%)
g. Welfare entered-employment rate	1 (10.5%)	2 (32.6%)	3 (48.3%)	4 (6.7%)	0 (1.8%)

C5. Are there additional client, economic, or program characteristics that you believe should be accounted for in the DOL models? (n = 354)

	Yes	1	(48.3%)
PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION C7, PAGE 7 <--	No	2	(51.7%)

C6. What are they?

_____

_____

_____

C. Performance Standards Issues (continued)

C7. For PY 86, the percent welfare recipients served had a weight of -.252 in the adult entered-employment-rate model. Indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about what this weight means. (n = 380)

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know
a. The weight indicates that welfare recipients have lower entered-employment rates than do nonrecipients.	1 (78.9%)	2 (12.1%)	0 (8.9%)
b. The weight indicates that the more welfare recipients served, the lower the standard will be.	1 (77.1%)	2 (12.0%)	0 (10.9%)
c. The weight indicates that the more welfare recipients served, the easier the standard will be to meet.	1 (34.3%)	2 (53.3%)	0 (12.4%)

C8. Did your SDA apply to the state for any governor's adjustments to its PY 86 performance standards? (n = 401)

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

	Yes	1 (12.0%)
PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION C11, PAGE 6 <--	No	2 (88.0%)

C9. For which standards did you apply for governor's adjustments? (n = 50)

(PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Adult entered-employment rate	1 (34.0%)
Adult wage at placement1	2 (58.0%)
Adult cost per entered employment	3 (32.7%)
Youth entered-employment rate	4 (38.8%)
Youth positive-termination rate	5 (37.3%)
Youth cost per positive termination	6 (36.0%)
Welfare entered-employment rate	7 (32.7%)
Additional state standards *(PLEASE SPECIFY:)*	
_____	1 (4.1%)
_____	2 (0.0%)

C. Performance Standards Issues (continued)

C10. On what basis did you ask for these governor's adjustments? (n = 47)

_____

_____

_____

C11. Did your SDA receive any governor's adjustments to its PY 86 performance standards? *(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)* (n = 381)

	Yes	1	(22.0%)
PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION C13, PAGE 7 <--	No	2	(78.0%)

C12. For which standards did you receive governor's adjustments? (n = 84)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Adult entered-employment rate	1	(48.8%)
Adult wage at placement	2	(66.7%)
Adult cost per entered employment	3	(48.8%)
Youth entered-employment rate	4	(47.6%)
Youth positive-termination rate	5	(48.8%)
Youth cost per positive termination	6	(47.6%)
Welfare entered-employment rate	7	(47.6%)
Additional state standards *(PLEASE SPECIFY:)*		
_____	1	(6.0%)
_____	2	(2.4%)
_____	3	(1.2%)

C. Performance Standards Issues (continued)

C13. Do you believe that your SDA's staff or PIC members could benefit from (additional) technical assistance in performance standards issues? (n = 505)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

	Yes	1	(53.1%)
PLEASE SKIP TO SECTION D <--	No	2	(46.9%)

C14. What areas should this (additional) technical assistance cover?

_____

_____

_____

D. PY 86 Intake Procedures

D1. In PY 86, which of the following organizations conducted JTPA outreach and program-assignment activities for your SDA? (n = 530)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY IN EACH COLUMN)

	Conducted Outreach	Assigned Participants to Program Activities
a. This SDA itself	1 (83.2%)	1 (71.7%)
b. Public schools (including secondary schools, community colleges)	2 (69.8%)	2 (47.9%)
c. Employment Service	3 (57.9%)	3 (27.2%)
d. Other government agencies	4 (45.7%)	4 (16.6%)
e. Community-based organizations, other non-profit organizations	5 (73.8%)	5 (43.8%)
f. For-profit organizations	6 (42.3%)	6 (24.2%)

D. PY 86 Intake Procedures (continued)

D2. How much difficulty, if any, did your SDA have recruiting a sufficient number of participants to expend its PY 86 funds? (n = 521)

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER IN EACH COLUMN)

	Adults	Youths
No difficulty	1 (48.2%)	1 (29.8%)
A little	2 (21.7%)	2 (23.6%)
Some	3 (22.8%)	3 (23.4%)
Quite a bit	4 (7.3%)	4 (23.2%)

D3. *Of those who applied and were eligible*, about what percent actually received JTPA services from your SDA in PY 86? (n = 507)

(PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR BEST ESTIMATE IN EACH COLUMN)

	Adults	Youths
Less than 25%	1 (3.9%)	1 (4.9%)
25% to 49%	2 (25.0%)	2 (16.8%)
50% to 74%	3 (37.7%)	3 (27.9%)
75% to 90%	4 (23.5%)	4 (33.8%)
90% or more	5 (9.9%)	5 (16.6%)

D. PY 86 Intake Procedures (continued)

D4. Did your SDA establish specific procedures to recruit and enroll any of the following types of individuals as priority groups for PY 86 (e.g., establish contract requirements, special programs)? (n = 530)

(PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY IN EACH COLUMN)

	Adults	Youths
Welfare recipients	1 (74.5%)	1 (57.7%)
School dropouts	2 (51.9%)	2 (77.4%)
In-school youth	--	3 (68.7%)
Minority groups	4 (39.2%)	4 (37.5%)
Limited English-language speaking	5 (21.5%)	5 (18.9%)
Handicapped	6 (59.4%)	6 (60.4%)
Offenders	7 (40.9%)	7 (39.6%)
Long-term unemployed	8 (27.5%)	8 (16.6%)
Single heads of households	9 (37.0%)	9 (31.3%)
Ages 14 - 15	--	10 (30.2%)
Other priority groups	11 (30.6%)	11 (17.7%)
No specific procedures for enrolling any of above groups	0 (7.0%)	0 (6.2%)

D5. Which of the following best describes how most participants were initially selected for JTPA in PY 86? (n = 516)

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Most were selected for JTPA participation in general and then were assigned to receive specific program services	1 (60.3%)
Most were selected directly for specific program services	2 (39.7%)

D6. In PY 86, what criteria were used to select eligible adult applicants for enrollment in each of the kinds of services provided? (n = 530)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY IN EACH COLUMN)

	SERVICES PROVIDED TO ADULTS:			
	Basic Educ'l Skills Training	Occupa-tional Skills Training	OJT	Job Search Assistance
a. Took everyone who was eligible and willing to participate	1 (36.0%)	1 (21.9%)	1 (25.1%)	1 (47.7%)
b. First come, first served in available slots	2 (22.5%)	2 (30.8%)	2 (27.9%)	2 (24.0%)
c. Gave priority to those with a high school diploma or GED	3 (1.3%)	3 (30.6%)	3 (14.3%)	3 (6.2%)
d. Gave priority to those who scored above a given reading level *(PLEASE SPECIFY GRADE LEVEL:)* 7.1	4 (7.5%)	4 (34.7%)	4 (8.7%)	4 (4.3%)
e. Gave priority to those who scored below a given reading level *(PLEASE SPECIFY GRADE LEVEL:)* 7.2	5 (39.6%)	5 (2.6%)	5 (1.7%)	5 (1.7%)
f. Gave priority to those with a high score on other basic skills test (e.g., math level, overall grade level)	6 (2.8%)	6 (30.4%)	6 (9.6%)	6 (5.1%)
g. Gave priority to those with a low score on other basic skills test (e.g., math level, overall grade level)	7 (41.3%)	7 (2.8%)	7 (1.9%)	7 (3.2%)
h. Used occupational skills test(s)	8 (11.7%)	8 (50.2%)	8 (30.4%)	8 (15.5%)
i. Used interest inventories or aptitude test(s)	9 (28.9%)	9 (65.3%)	9 (47.0%)	9 (31.7%)
j. Gave priority to those with previous work history	10 (1.1%)	10 (5.5%)	10 (34.0%)	10 (26.6%)
k. Gave priority to those judged more likely to complete the program	11 (16.0%)	11 (46.8%)	11 (45.5%)	11 (20.6%)
l. Successful completion of other program activity	12 (5.3%)	12 (20.9%)	12 (26.0%)	12 (18.1%)
m. Gave priority to those referred from other agencies or schools	13 (16.2%)	13 (20.8%)	13 (16.2%)	13 (13.8%)
n. Employer selection	14 (2.1%)	14 (7.5%)	14 (73.6%)	14 (6.8%)

D7. In PY 86, what criteria were used to select eligible youth applicants for enrollment in each of the kinds of services provided? (n = 530)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY IN EACH COLUMN)

	SERVICES PROVIDED TO YOUTHS:			
	Basic Educ'l Skills Training	Occupational Skills Training	OJT	Preemployment/Work Maturity Training
a. Took everyone who was eligible and willing to participate	1 (39.8%)	1 (23.6%)	1 (27.9%)	1 (45.3%)
b. First come, first served in available slots	2 (23.0%)	2 (28.9%)	2 (24.9%)	2 (29.1%)
c. Gave priority to those with a high school diploma or GED	3 (1.1%)	3 (29.8%)	3 (16.8%)	3 (3.2%)
d. Gave priority to those who scored above a given reading level *(PLEASE SPECIFY GRADE LEVEL:)* 7.1	4 (6.6%)	4 (29.2%)	4 (8.7%)	4 (4.5%)
e. Gave priority to those who scored below a given reading level *(PLEASE SPECIFY GRADE LEVEL:)* 6.9	5 (40.9%)	5 (3.8%)	5 (2.3%)	5 (10.9%)
f. Gave priority to those with a high score on other basic skills test (e.g., math level, overall grade level)	6 (2.5%)	6 (29.4%)	6 (11.5%)	6 (2.8%)
g. Gave priority to those with a low score on other basic skills test (e.g., math level, overall grade level)	7 (44.5%)	7 (4.0%)	7 (3.0%)	7 (16.8%)
h. Used occupational skills test(s)	8 (11.9%)	8 (45.1%)	8 (27.5%)	8 (14.9%)
i. Used interest inventories or aptitude test(s)	9 (26.8%)	9 (58.1%)	9 (41.9%)	9 (33.2%)
j. Used preemployment/work maturity competency test	10 (13.6%)	10 (16.8%)	10 (18.7%)	10 (50.4%)
k. Gave priority to those with previous work history	11 (0.9%)	11 (8.5%)	11 (29.4%)	11 (4.3%)
l. Gave priority to those judged more likely to complete the program	12 (14.3%)	12 (42.3%)	12 (39.1%)	12 (17.0%)
m. Successful completion of other program activity	13 (4.9%)	13 (23.8%)	13 (28.5%)	13 (7.9%)
n. Gave priority to those referred from other agencies or schools	14 (24.2%)	14 (22.5%)	14 (18.5%)	14 (26.2%)
o. Employer selection	15 (1.1%)	15 (7.4%)	15 (62.3%)	15 (4.9%)

D. PY 86 Intake Procedures (continued)

D8. **IF TESTS WERE USED AS A BASIS FOR SELECTING ADULT OR YOUTH PARTICIPANTS INTO PROGRAM SERVICES,** Who chose to use these tests?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

	(n = 388) Adult	(n = 391) Youth
Service providers	1 (19.6%)	1 (18.2%)
This SDA	2 (33.0%)	2 (32.7%)
Both	3 (47.4%)	3 (49.1%)

E. Program Services

E1. *Of the adults who received basic skills training in PY 86,* about what percent also received occupational skills training or OJT? (n = 437)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Less than 25%	1 (37.8%)
25% to 49%	2 (27.0%)
50% to 74%	3 (18.1%)
75% or more	4 (17.2%)

E2. About what percent of PY 86 OJT participants were selected first by employers and then were referred to JTPA (or contractors) to determine eligibility? (n = 498)
(PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR BEST ESTIMATE)

Less than 10%	1 (52.8%)
10% to 29%	2 (28.7%)
30% to 49%	3 (11.0%)
50% or more	4 (7.4%)

E. Program Services (continued)

E3. Were any Youth Employment Competency systems in place during PY 86? (n = 526)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

	Yes	1	(89.0%)
PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION E12, PAGE 16 <--	No	2	(11.0%)

E4. Was a pre-employment/work maturity competency in place during PY 86?
(If only a pre-employment or a work maturity competency was in place in PY 86, please answer about that component) (n = 473)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

	Yes	1	(92.6%)
PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION E7, PAGE 14 <--	No	2	(7.4%)

E5. What percent of the pre-employment/work maturity competency elements did a PY 86 participant need to be deficient in before being assessed as needing pre-employment/work maturity competency skills training? (n = 423)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Less than 15%	1	(17.3%)
15% to 24%	2	(19.6%)
25% to 49%	3	(18.0%)
50% to 74%	4	(16.5%)
75% or more	5	(9.7%)
Varied among providers	0	(18.9%)

E. Program Services (continued)

E6. What percent of the competency elements did the PY 86 participant have to pass in order to attain a pre-employment/work maturity competency? (n = 432)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Less than 25%	1	(1.9%)
25% to 49%	2	(1.4%)
50% to 74%	3	(11.6%)
75% to 84%	4	(40.7%)
85% or more	5	(35.2%)
Varied among providers	0	(9.3%)

E7. Was a basic skills competency in place during PY 86? (n = 464)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Yes	1	(56.5%)
PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION E10, PAGE 15 <-- No	2	(43.5%)

E8. How far below reading-grade level did a PY 86 participant need to score before being assessed as deficient in basic skills? (n = 282)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Less than one grade	1	(6.0%)
One up to two grades	2	(19.1%)
Two grades or more	3	(21.3%)
Below a specific grade level *(PLEASE SPECIFY:)*		
6.9	4	(20.9%)
Varied among providers	0	(12.4%)
Didn't use this criterion	9	(20.2%)

E. Program Services (continued)

E9. How many reading-grade levels did a PY 86 participant have to gain in order to attain a basic skills competency? (n = 281)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Less than 0.5	1	(2.5%)
0.5 to 0.9	2	(5.3%)
1.0 to 1.4	3	(28.5%)
1.5 to 1.9	4	(3.9%)
2.0 or more	5	(13.9%)
Attained a specific grade level *(PLEASE SPECIFY:)*		
8.0	6	(8.9%)
Varied among providers	0	(15.7%)
Didn't use this criterion	9	(21.4%)

E10. *Of the youths who received basic skills training in PY 86*, what percent also received occupational skills training, work experience, or OJT? (n = 383)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

No basic skills offered	0	(0.0%)
Less than 25%	1	(38.1%)
25% to 49%	2	(25.1%)
50% to 74%	3	(17.8%)
75% or more	4	(19.1%)

E11. Was a job-specific skills competency in place during PY 86? (n = 461)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Yes	1	(44.3%)
No	2	(55.7%)

E. Program Services (continued)

E12. Some SDAs use funds from other JTPA programs to help fund services for 78% clients, enrolling clients in both programs. What other JTPA programs, if any, provided joint funding for PY 86 78% programs in your SDA?

(PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION E14, PAGE 17 <-- No others	0	(25.7%)	(n = 530)
JTPA 3% programs	1	(36.7%)	(n = 381)
JTPA 8% programs	2	(80.4%)	
JTPA Title II-B programs	3	(55.2%)	
JTPA Title III programs	4	(24.3%)	

E13. During PY 86, about what percent of 78% clients were dual enrolled in other JTPA programs? (n = 428)

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Less than 10%	1	(57.5%)
10% to 29%	2	(36.0%)
30% to 49%	3	(5.1%)
50% or more	4	(1.4%)

E14. What other programs or organizations, if any, provided resources to help supplement JTPA 78% adult or youth programs in PY 86--either direct funding or in-kind?

(PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION E16, PAGE 17 <-- No others	0	(22.3%)	(n = 530)
Welfare agency	1	(60.2%)	(n = 387)
Public schools	2	(72.9%)	
Other public agencies	3	(53.2%)	
Private sector	4	(32.8%)	
Other *(PLEASE SPECIFY:)* _____	5	(18.6%)	

E. Program Services (continued)

E15. During PY 86, about what percent of 78% enrollees participated in programs that received resources from other programs or organizations? (n = 445)

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Less than 10%	1	(35.1%)
10% to 29%	2	(36.6%)
30% to 49%	3	(15.1%)
50% or more	4	(13.3%)

E16. About what percent of the youths enrolled in your PY 86 78% programs had previously been enrolled in and terminated from JTPA 78% programs? (n = 502)

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Less than 10%	1	(73.7%)
10% to 29%	2	(21.7%)
30% to 49%	3	(3.8%)
50% or more	4	(0.8%)

E17. After individuals were selected to receive PY 86 JTPA services, for how long did they typically receive preenrollment services such as counseling or assessment before they were formally enrolled into JTPA? (n = 516)

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

For less than 3 days	1	(46.9%)
For 3 to 5 days	2	(25.8%)
For 6 to 10 days	3	(14.3%)
For 11 to 15 days	4	(6.2%)
For more than 15 days	5	(6.8%)

E. Program Services (continued)

E18. The JTPA Annual Status Report (JASR) defines entered employment as entering full-or part-time unsubsidized employment at the time of termination. In reports of SDA performance on the entered-employment rate to the state, do you use this definition, or do you define entered employment in some other way?

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER) (n = 526)

Use JASR definition for state reports	1	(91.8%)
Use another definition for state reports	2	(8.2%)

E19. In report of SDA performance on the entered-employment rate to the PIC, do you (use the JASR definition or do you define entered employment in some other way?

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER) (n = 520)

Use JASR definition for PIC reports	1	(88.7%)
Use another definition for PIC reports	2	(11.3%)

E20. **IF USE ANOTHER DEFINITION FOR EITHER STATE OR PIC REPORTS,** What is the definition that you use?

_____

_____

_____

F. Service Provider Arrangements

F1. Did you use any performance-based contracts for training services in PY 86?

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER) (n = 525)

Yes	1	(78.1%)
PLEASE SKIP TO SECTION G, PAGE 25 <-- No	2	(21.9%)

F. Service Provider Arrangements (continued)

F2. Some SDAs set the same contract terms for all performance-based contracts while other SDAs vary the contract terms among service providers. For adult PY 86 programs, which of the following aspects (if any) of the performance-based contracts varied among service providers? (n = 411)

(PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

	These aspects varied:		
	Total amount of full unit price	1	(75.9%)
	Proportion of payment for final outcome	2	(58.9%)
	Intermediate outcomes for which partial payments were made	3	(58.5%)
	Minimum wage rate	4	(59.1%)
	Whether payments were made for retention	5	(26.3%)
	Entered-employment rate goals	6	(52.3%)
	Requirements for service levels to specific client groups	7	(39.7%)
PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION F4, PAGE 20 <--	None of the above. All terms were the same for all PY 86 performance-based contracts for adult programs	0	(11.9%)

F3. On what basis did these terms of your performance-based contracts vary? (n = 366)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Characteristics of participant to be served	1	(60.4%)
Type of service offered	2	(84.2%)
Characteristics of service provider	3	(48.2%)

F. Service Provider Arrangements (continued)

NOTE: IF ASPECTS OF ADULT PERFORMANCE-BASED CONTRACTS VARIED, PLEASE ANSWER QUESTIONS F4 THROUGH F11 WITH REGARD TO YOUR LARGEST ADULT PERFOMANCE-BASED CONTRACT.

F4. What payment points were included in the performance-based contracts for adult PY 86 programs? (n = 411)
(If these varied, answer for your largest adult performance-based contract.)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Payment points:		
Enrollment	1	(69.8%)
Intermediate outcomes before completion of training	2	(47.1%)
Completion of training	3	(69.9%)
Placement in any job at termination	4	(29.2%)
Placement at termination in a training-related job at a specified wage rate	5	(82.3%)
Retention in a job for a specified period of time *(PLEASE SPECIFY PERIOD:)* 1.3 months	6	(64.6%)
Other *(PLEASE SPECIFY:)* _____	7	(11.5%)

F5. For adult PY 86 contracts, about what percent of the full payment was paid for placement, including retention outcomes? (n = 386)
(If this varied, answer for your largest adult performance-based contract.)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Less than 25%	1	(19.9%)
25% to 49%	2	(38.2%)
50% to 74%	3	(19.6%)
75% to 99%	4	(12.4%)
100%	5	(9.8%)

F. Service Provider Arrangements (continued)

F6. What minimum wage rate was specified in the performance-based contracts for adult PY 86 programs? (n = 370)
(If this varied, answer for your largest adult performance-based contract.)

$ 4.43

F7. Was an entered-employment rate level specified as part of the performance-based contracts for adult PY 86 programs? (n = 385)
(If this varied, answer for your largest adult performance-based contract.)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

	Yes	1	(72.2%)
PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION F10 <--	No	2	(27.8%)

F8. What was that entered-employment rate? 70.5%
(If this varied, answer for your largest adult performance-based contract.) (n = 271)

F9. Was a bonus paid to the contractor if the specified entered-employment rate was achieved or exceeded? (n = 307)
(If this varied, answer for your largest adult performance-based contract.)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

	Yes	1	(15.6%)
	No	2	(84.4%)

F10. Did the performance based contracts for adult PY 86 programs specify required levels of service to different client groups? (n = 391)
(If this varied, answer for your largest adult performance-based contract.)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

	Yes	1	(38.9%)
PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION F12, PAGE 22 <--	No	2	(61.1%)

F. Service Provider Arrangements (continued)

F11. Was a bonus paid to the contractor for meeting or exceeding the required levels of service to different client groups? (n = 248)
(If this varied, answer for your largest adult performance-based contract.)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Yes	1	(8.1%)
No	2	(91.9%)

F12. For youth competency-oriented PY 86 contracts, which of the following aspects (if any) of the performance-based contracts varied among service providers?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

PLEASE SKIP TO SECTION G, PAGE 25<-- Doesn't apply: No competency-oriented performance-based contracts in PY 86	0	(33.8%)	(n = 512)
These aspects varied:			
Total amount of full unit price	1	(42.9%)	(n = 340)
Definition of final outcome	2	(20.4%)	
Proportion of payment for final outcome	3	(31.3%)	
Intermediate outcomes for which partial payments were made	4	(29.2%)	
Competency attainment rate	5	(23.3%)	
Required service levels to specific client groups	6	(20.4%)	
None of the above. All terms were the same for all PY 86 competency-oriented performance-based contracts for youth programs	7	(20.9%)	

F13. On what basis did these terms of your performance-based contracts vary? (n = 290)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Characteristics of participant to be served	1	(40.4%)
Type of service offered	2	(54.1%)
Characteristics of service provider	3	(30.7%)

F. Service Provider Arrangements (continued)

NOTE: IF ASPECTS OF YOUTH COMPETENCY-ORIENTED PERFORMANCE-BASED CONTRACTS VARIED, PLEASE ANSWER QUESTIONS F14 THROUGH F20 WITH REGARD TO YOUR LARGEST YOUTH PERFOMANCE-BASED CONTRACT.

F14. What payment points were included in the competency-oriented performance-based contracts for youth PY 86 programs? (n = 339)
(If this varied, answer for your largest youth performance-based contract.)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Payment points:		
Enrollment	1	(49.6%)
Intermediate outcomes before completion of training	2	(31.3%)
Completion of training	3	(44.6%)
Attainment of competency	4	(59.4%)
Other *(PLEASE SPECIFY:)* _____	5	(22.7%)

F15. For competency-oriented youth PY 86 contracts, about what percent of the full payment was paid for the final outcome? (n = 223)
(If this varied, answer for your largest youth performance-based contract.)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Less than 25%	1	(23.3%)
25% to 49%	2	(32.7%)
50% to 74%	3	(20.2%)
75% to 99%	4	(13.9%)
100%	5	(9.9%)

F16. Was a competency attainment rate goal specified as part of the performance-based contracts for youth PY 86 programs? (n = 228)
(If this varied, answer for your largest youth performance-based contract.)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Yes	1	(71.1%)
PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION F19, PAGE 24 <-- No	2	(28.9%)

F. Service Provider Arrangements (continued)

F17. What was that competency attainment rate goal? (n = 157) 76.6%
(If this varied, answer for your largest youth performance-based contract.)

F18. To what type of competency did this goal apply? (n = 128)
(If this varied, answer for your largest youth performance-based contract.)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Pre-employment/work maturity	1	(79.7%)
Basic skills	2	(10.9%)
Job-specific	3	(9.4%)

F19. Was a bonus paid to the contractor if that competency attainment rate goal was achieved or exceeded? (n = 215)
(If this varied, answer for your largest youth performance-based contract.)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Yes	1	(10.2%)
No	2	(89.8%)

F20. Did the competency-oriented performance-based contracts for youth PY 86 programs require levels of service to different client groups? (n = 225)
(If this varied, answer for your largest youth performance-based contract.)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

	Yes	1	(34.7%)
PLEASE SKIP TO SECTION G, PAGE 25 <--	No	2	(65.3%)

F21. Was a bonus paid to the contractor for meeting or exceeding the required levels of service to different client groups? (n = 133)
(If this varied, answer for your largest youth performance-based contract.)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Yes	1	(6.0%)
No	2	(94.0%)

G. SDA Characteristics

G1. What organization is the grant recipient for this SDA? (n = 521)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

PIC	1	(15.2%)
Unit(s) of local government	2	(56.8%)
Non-profit organization	3	(12.1%)
Other *(PLEASE SPECIFY:)* _____	4	(15.9%)

G2. What organization is the administrative entity? (n = 521)
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

PIC	1	(18.6%)
Unit(s) of local government	2	(49.1%)
Non-profit organization	3	(15.2%)
Other *(PLEASE SPECIFY:)* _____	4	(17.1%)

G3. About what percent of the SDA's current staff worked for the CETA program? (n = 522)
(PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR BEST ESTIMATE)

Less than 25%	1	(30.1%)
25% to 49%	2	(26.6%)
50% to 74%	3	(21.5%)
75% or more	4	(21.8%)

G. SDA Characteristics (continued)

G4. Who was the primary respondent to the questions of pages 4-26 of this questionnaire? (n = 486)

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Director	1	(63.4%)
Assistant director	2	(14.4%)
Planning chief	3	(10.9%)
MIS chief	4	(1.2%)
Other *(PLEASE SPECIFY:)* _____	5	(10.1%)

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION.

Please use the enclosed postage-paid envelope to return this questionnaire to:

SRI International, Employment and Training Research Program
333 Ravenswood Avenue, Menlo Park, CA 94025

AVERAGE RESPONSES ON FISCAL/MIS QUESTIONNAIRE

STUDY OF PY 86 JTPA II-A 78% PROGRAMS

FISCAL/MIS QUESTIONNAIRE

A. SDA PY 86 AVAILABLE RESOURCES FOR REGULAR TITLE II-A PROGRAMS

A1. Total Title II-A allocation for PY 86 for 78% programs: $ 2,325,415

A2. Amount carried over into PY 86 from 78% funds in previous program years: $ 645,089
(If none, please enter zero)

A3. Total incentive funds received for performance in previous program years that are available for use in PY 86: $ 181,063
(If none, please enter zero)

B. SDA PY 86 EXPENDITURES FOR REGULAR TITLE II-A PROGRAMS

Note: Questions in this section refer to PY 86 expenditures from the 78% allocation, carryover funds, and incentive funds available for use in PY 86.

B1. Total PY 86 expenditures from the 78% allocation, carryover funds, and incentive funds: $ 2,496,617

B2. PY 86 administrative costs: $ 360,068

B3. PY 86 participant support costs (include needs-based payments, work-experience costs subject to expenditure limitations, and applicable employment generating activities): $ 276,342

B4. PY 86 actual expenditures for youth (including administrative expenditures): $ 1,050,417

B. SDA PY 86 EXPENDITURES FOR REGULAR TITLE II-A PROGRAMS (continued)

B5. PY 86 required youth expenditure rate (i.e., percent of PY 86 expenditures that were required to be spent on youth): 36.5 %

B6. PY 86 expenditures in performance-based contracts:

ADULT	YOUTH
$ 434,982	$ 297,077

B7. For PY 86, what were the program services provided by the following types of organizations?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY IN EACH COLUMN)

	SERVICES PROVIDED:			
	Basic Educ'l Skills Training	Occupational Skills Training	OJT	Job Search Assistance or Preemployment/ Work Maturity Training
a. The SDA itself	1 (24.3%)	2 (21.6%)	3 (57.7%)	4 (59.3%)
b. Public schools (including secondary schools and community colleges)	1 (77.0%)	2 (84.8%)	3 (10.0%)	4 (56.1%)
c. Employment Service or other government agencies	1 (6.6%)	2 (8.6%)	3 (25.9%)	4 (38.2%)
d. Community-based organizations or other non-profit organizations	1 (37.0%)	2 (45.0%)	3 (39.3%)	4 (55.7%)
e. For-profit organizations	1 (9.3%)	2 (51.1%)	3 (35.0%)	4 (24.1%)

C. SDA PY 86 EXPENDITURES ON OTHER JTPA PROGRAMS

C1. PY 86 expenditures by SDA for each of the following programs (including administrative costs): *(If none, please enter zero)*

a. Title II-A 8% programs:	$ 147,186
b. Title II-A 3% programs:	$ 62,220
c. 1986 Title II-B programs:	$ 1,044,508
d. Title III programs:	$ 163,302

D. PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

D1. Incentive funds received for PY 86 performance: $ 119,608
(If none, please enter zero)

D2. Final recalculated PY 86 performance standards, including any governor's adjustments:

a. Adult-entered-employment rate:	66.6%
b. Adult wage at placement:	$ 4.81
c. Adult cost per entered employment:	$ 4,107
d. Welfare-entered-employment rate:	57.0%
e. Youth-entered-employment rate:	45.5%
f. Youth-positive-termination rate:	80.0%
g. Youth cost-per-positive-termination:	$ 3,382
h. Other *(please specify any other performance standards that were set for this SDA:)*	
_____	_____
_____	_____

E. PROGRAM SERVICES

E1. We would like to know how many individuals received various kinds of rogram services, as listed in Question E2 on the following page. BEFORE you answer that question, however, please give us the following information about how you count who receives program services.

a. Which of the following best describes how you count the numbers of individuals who received various PY 86 program services?

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Individuals who received a program service at any time (i.e., individuals who received multiple services are counted in all categories)	1	(73.4%)
Primary program service of individual	2	(15.0%)
First program service of individual	3	(2.3%)
Last program service of individual	4	(9.2%)

b. Do the numbers of individuals who received various PY 86 program services represent terminees, or do they represent participants? *(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

Terminees	1	(17.8%)
Participants	2	(82.2%)

E. PROGRAM SERVICES (continued)

E2. Now that you've told us <u>how</u> you count how many individuals received various PY 86 program services, please give us the <u>numbers</u> for each category listed below. *(If <u>none</u>, please enter "0")*

	NUMBER RECEIVING PY 86 SERVICES	
	Adults	Youths
a. Job search assistance (including preemployment/work maturity training and direct placement)	24.7%	24.8%
b. Classroom training in basic educational skills (including GED)	7.0%	10.7%
c. Classroom training in occupational skills (including vocational education, skill upgrading and retraining)	31.7%	15.6%
d. On-the-job training	29.8%	14.3%
e. Work experience	2.9%	12.3%
f. Entry employment experience for youths (including try-out employment, school-to-work transition, and cooperative educ.)		16.5%
g. Other services *(please specify:)*		
_____	4.0%	5.8%
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION.

Please use the enclosed postage-paid envelope to return this questionnaire to:

SRI International, Employment and Training Research Program
333 Ravenswood Avenue, Menlo Park, CA 94025

AVERAGE EXPENDITURE PERCENTAGES BASED ON THE FISCAL/MIS QUESTIONNAIRE

	Average
Expenditures as a percentage of available II-A 78% funds	81.1%
As a percentage of total II-A 78% expenditures:	
Administration	14.6%
Supportive services	10.4%
Expenditures on youth	41.3%
Expenditures on performance-based contracts	24.9%
Adult	25.1%
Youth	24.0%
Expenditures on other programs (Title II-A 8%, Title II-A 3%, Title II-B, Title III)	60.9%
Incentive funds as a percentage of allocation	7.1%

Note: These are average percentages and do not equal percentages based on the averages presented in the questionnaire.

DISTRIBUTION OF ANSWERS ON STATE PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
CODING FORM

STATE PERFORMANCE STANDARDS CODING FORM

A. Adjustment Procedures

A1. Is the DOL model or the national standard used for each of the standards? (n = 51)

	DOL Model	National Standard	Other
Adult entered-employment rate	1 (84.3%)	2 (15.7%)	3 (0.0%)
Adult wage at placement	1 (84.3%)	2 (7.8%)	3 (7.8%)
Adult cost per entered employment	1 (84.3%)	2 (13.7%)	3 (2.0%)
Youth entered-employment rate	1 (84.3%)	2 (13.7%)	3 (2.0%)
Youth positive-termination rate	1 (84.3%)	2 (13.7%)	3 (2.0%)
Youth cost per positive termination	1 (82.4%)	2 (15.7%)	3 (2.0%)
Welfare entered-employment rate (either model or ratio method)	1 (84.3%)	2 (15.7%)	3 (0.0%)

A3. Is there a stated policy to allow for additional adjustments beyond the model? (n = 51)

Go to B1 --	MODELS NOT USED	0 (5.9%)
	Yes	1 (51.0%)
Go to B1 --	No	2 (43.1%)

A4. Are some adjustments granted across the board or must SDAs apply for all adjustments? (n = 26)

	Across the board	1 (46.2%)
	SDAs apply	2 (53.8%)

A5. Are there explicit procedures specified for applying for adjustments, beyond simply references to DOL TAG?? (n = 26)

	Yes	1 (57.7%)
Go to B1 --	No	2 (42.3%)

A6. IF YES, For which factors are adjustments considered? (n = 15)
(Circle all that apply)

Clients served	1 (86.7%)
Services offered	2 (73.3%)
Economic conditions	3 (93.3%)

A7. Does the policy specify that adjustments should be requested at the planning stage? (n = 15)

Yes	1 (60%)
No	2 (40%)

B. Additional Standards

B1. What additional standards, if any, have been established? (Note: If state awarded a portion of incentive money based on whether the SDA met a state performance goal, it was coded as a standard even if the state did not call it a standard.)

Go To C1 -- NONE	0 (64.7%)	(n = 51)
Postprogram employment/retention	1 (33.3%)	(n = 18)
Post program earnings	2 (5.6%)	
Service to dropouts	3 (16.7%)	
Service to welfare/WIN registrants	4 (16.7%)	
Service to minorities	5 (16.7%)	
Service to women	6 (11.1%)	
Service to handicapped	7 (5.6%)	
Service to older workers	8 (5.6%)	
Placement of dropouts	9 (11.1%)	
Placement of welfare/WIN	10 (11.1%)	
Placement of minorities	11 (11.1%)	
Placement of women	12 (5.6%)	
Placement of handicapped	13 (5.6%)	
Placement of older workers	14 (5.6%)	
Economic development (e.g., placements in growth industries)	15 (5.6%)	
Youth cost per entered employment	16 (5.6%)	
Placement of hard-to-serve	17 (5.6%)	
Service to hard-to-serve	18 (16.7%)	
Weeks worked	19 (5.6%)	
Youth wage at placement	20 (5.6%)	
Wage gain	21 (5.6%)	
Welfare job retention	22 (5.6%)	
Expenditure rates	23 (11.1%)	
Entered employment for training activities	24 (5.6%)	

C. Hard-to-serve policies

C1. Are explicit policies established for serving specific hard-to-serve groups in JTPA, other than additional standards? Which groups? (Circle all that apply)

	Adults	Youths	
Go To C3 -- NONE	0 (41.2%)	0 (41.2%)	(n = 51)
Welfare recipients/WIN	1 (60.0%)	1 (56.7%)	(n = 30)
School dropouts	2 (40.0%)	2 (46.7%)	
In-school youth, in general	--	3 (6.7%)	
In-school youth, potential dropouts	--	4 (3.3%)	
Minority groups	5 (33.3%)	5 (36.7%)	
Limited English-language speaking	6 (20.0%)	6 (20.0%)	
Handicapped	7 (63.3%)	7 (63.3%)	
Offenders	8 (46.7%)	8 (50.0%)	
Long-term unemployed	9 (6.7%)	9 (6.7%)	
Single heads of households	10 (40.0%)	10 (50.0%)	
Ages 14 - 15	--	11 (0.0%)	
Older adults	12 (36.7%)	--	
Other priority groups	13 (53.3%)	13 (53.3%)	
SDA option	14 (23.3%)	14 (23.3%)	

C3. Other than incentive funds, has the state established a pool of 6% funds at the state level to be used for programs for the hard-to serve? (n = 51)

Yes	1 (13.7%)
Go to D1 -- No	2 (86.3%)

C4. Approximately what percent of 6% funds are set aside for this state pool for serving the hard to serve? (n = 7)

48.9%

D. Incentive Policy

D1. Maximum percent of 6% funds that would be used for incentives if all SDAs met standards? (n = 48*)

79.1%

D2. What percent of the incentives are awarded proportional to the size of the SDA? (n = 48)

65.2%

Criteria for Qualifying for Incentives

D3. Above what level must SDAs perform to qualify for incentives? (n = 48)

Above standard	1 (68.1%)	(n = 48)
Above upper bound of tolerance range	2 (19.1%)	
Above lower bound of tolerance range	3 (8.5%)	
Above % of standards	4 (2.1%)	
Specify 2%		
High ranking among SDAs in state	5 (2.1%)	

D4. Which standards, if any, are in a core set of standards that are given priority in determining which SDAs qualify for incentives? (Circle all that apply)

Go to D5-- NO CORE SET	0 (81.3%)	(n = 48)
Adult entered-employment rate	1 (88.9%)	(n = 9)
Adult wage at placement	2 (22.2%)	
Adult cost per entered employment	3 (22.2%)	
Youth entered-employment rate	4 (33.3%)	
Youth positive-termination rate	5 (33.3%)	
Youth cost per positive termination	6 (0.0%)	
Welfare entered-employment rate	7 (77.8%)	
State standards, specify		
_____	8 (11.1%)	

* Three single-SDA states did not specify these details in their policies.

D5. Minimum number of standards must meet to qualify for any incentives? (n = 47*)

3.6%

Criteria for Determining the Amount of Incentives

D6. In determining the weight for each standard, which of the following is used for a majority of the funds: (n = 47)

Separate pools of funds for each standard	1 (46.8%)
Percent above standard	2 (42.6%)
Percentage points or dollars above standard	3 (6.4%)
Other	4 (4.3%)

D7. What is the weight given to each standards in determining the amount of incentives?

Go To D8 -- EQUAL WEIGHTS FOR EACH STANDARD	1 (57.4%)	(n = 47)
Adult entered-employment rate	16.9%	(n = 20)
Adult wage at placement	15.0%	
Adult cost per entered employment	11.7%	
Youth entered-employment rate	14.1%	
Youth positive-termination rate	8.8%	
Youth cost per positive termination	8.0%	
Welfare entered-employment rate	15.4%	
Total of state standards	10.2%*	

*29.2% for those with state standards

D8. What percent of the total incentive payment is received for marginally exceeding standards (i.e., for being eligible for incentives)?

34.7% (n = 47)

---

* One additional single-SDA state did not specify these details in its policy.

D9. Is there a threshold above which the SDA no longer receives additional incentives for improving performance on individual standards? (n = 47)

Yes	1 (44.7%)
Go to D11 -- No	2 (55.3%)

D10. What percent above the standard (or minimum qualifying level) is that threshold set? (n = 22)

23.4%

D11. Is there a maximum number of standards that are considered so that an SDA would not receive additional incentives for exceeding additional standards? (n = 47)

Yes	1 (2.1%)
Go to D13 -- No	2 (97.9%)

D12. What is that maximum number of standards? (n = 1) 5

D13. Do SDAs receive extra bonuses for extraordinary performance? (n = 47)

Yes	1 (14.9%)
No	2 (85.1%)

D15. Is there competition among SDAs so that the amount received by one SDA depends on the performance of other SDAs? (n = 47)

Yes	1 (66.7%)
No	2 (33.3%)

Additional Requirements

D16. Other than additional standards, are requirements about serving the hard-to-serve incorporated into the incentive policy? Which groups?

	Adults	Youths	
Go to D18 -- NONE	0 (89.4%)	0 (89.4%)	(n = 47)
Welfare recipients/WIN	1 (80.0%)	1 (80.0%)	(n = 5)
School dropouts	2 (60.0%)	2 (60.0%)	
In-school youth, in general	--	3 (0.0%)	
In-school youth, potential dropouts	--	4 (0.0%)	
Minority groups	5 (20.0%)	5 (40.0%)	
Limited English-language speaking	6 (0.0%)	6 (0.0%)	
Handicapped	7 (60.0%)	7 (60.0%)	
Offenders	8 (60.0%)	8 (60.0%)	
Long-term unemployed	9 (20.0%)	9 (20.0%)	
Single heads of households	10 (40.0%)	10 (60.0%)	
Ages 14 - 15	--	11 (0.0%)	
Older adults	12 (40.0%)	--	
Other priority groups	13 (20.0%)	13 (20.0%)	
SDA option	14 (20.0%)	14 (20.0%)	

D18. Are expenditure rate requirements incorporated into the incentive policy? (n = 47)

Yes	1 (31.9%)
No	2 (68.1%)

D20. Is there a requirement that incentive funds must be used to serve the hard-to-serve? (n = 47)

Yes, all	1 (2.1%)
Yes, partially	2 (4.3%)
No	3 (93.6%)

D21. Are 6% funds excluded from the evaluation of an SDA's performance if they are used to serve the hard to serve? (n = 47)

Yes	1 (17.0%)
No	2 (83.0%)

E. Sanction Policy

E1. Which standards, if any, has the state established as a core set of standards that are given priority in determining whether SDAs fail their standards? (Circle all that apply)

Go to E2 -- NO CORE SET	0 (83.3%)	(n = 42*)
Adult entered-employment rate	1 (85.7%)	(n = 7)
Adult wage at placement	2 (28.6%)	
Adult cost per entered employment	3 (42.9%)	
Youth entered-employment rate	4 (42.9%)	
Youth positive-termination rate	5 (42.9%)	
Youth cost per positive termination	6 (14.3%)	
Welfare entered-employment rate	7 (57.1%)	

E2. Minimum number of standards that must fail to be classified as "failed to meet" in one year? (n = 41)

3.1%

E3. How does the state define failing two consecutive years? (n = 38)

Miss all same standards	1 (21.1%)
Miss some of the same standards	2 (7.9%)
Miss the same number of standards within the core set	3 (13.2%)
Miss same number of standards, regardless of which ones	4 (57.9%)

E4. Below what level is considered failure? (n = 40)

Below standard	1 (52.5%)
Below lower level of tolerance range	2 (40.0%)
Below the upper level of tolerance range	3 (2.5%)
Below % of standard	4 (5.0%)
Specify 85%	

* Nine states did not have a sanction policy. Several aditional states did not specify specific items so that the number of cases with valid data varies.

OUTLINE OF TOPICS FOR ON-SITE DISCUSSIONS

OUTLINE OF TOPICS FOR ON-SITE DISCUSSIONS: STATE STAFF
QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

OUTLINE OF TOPICS FOR ON-SITE DISCUSSIONS: STATE STAFF
QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

SJTCC **A. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF DIFFERENT STATE-LEVEL ACTORS**

* 1. What are the relative responsibilities of State legislature, SJTCC members, SJTCC staff, Governor, state JTPA administrative staff in initiating state policy, overseeing program implementation, suggesting revisions to state policy, reviewing requests for adjustments, implementing incentive and sanction policies?

* 2. What is the frequency of SJTCC meetings, topics discussed, policy role?

3. What are the particular interests of the Governor's office in JTPA policies?

* 4. What are the responsibilities of SJTCC staff versus state JTPA administrative staff?

B. SUMMARY VIEWS ON PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

* 1. Overall, how useful are the performance standards as measures of JTPA national program goals?

* 2. Overall, how have the performance standards affected perceptions of the JTPA program by SDAs, employers, and the general public?

* 3. How does the state view the relative importance of the different federal standards?

* 4. What are some of the specific ways in which the existence of performance standards has furthered federal or state objectives for JTPA?

(Probe: e.g. emphasis on outcomes; emphasis on improving performance over time; emphasis on serving welfare recipients because of existence of AWEE standard; emphasis on cost effectiveness)

5. What are some of the specific ways in which the existence of performance standards has interfered with or created incentives that make the realization of federal or state objectives more difficult to achieve?

(Probe: e.g. incentive to cream; encouragement of superficial low cost interventions; encouragement of "over-performance"; too hard for PICs to understand mechanics of model or mechanics of incentive policy; YECs are meaningless; standards make it hard to target hard-to-serve)

* 6. What are your suggestions for improving the way the performance standards system works? How would this change the incentives operating on SDAs and/or service providers?

C. STATE VIEWS ON PERFORMANCE STANDARDS DESIGN

1. How does the mere existence of the seven federal performance standards influence SDA behavior, irrespective of the numerical levels that are set? What kinds of influences result from the mere existence of the seven federal standards?

   (Probe: e.g. has existence of AWEE standard encouraged/discouraged service to welfare recipients? has the existence of AEE standard or AWE standard encouraged/discouraged services to individuals or groups with particular employment barriers? has the existence of a cost standard caused SDAs to design only "cheap" services?)

* 2. Do you have any suggestions for changing the number of standards (introducing new standards, deleting standards, combining standards)?

3. How has the numerical level at which the federal standards are set influenced the behavior of SDAs?

   (Probe: Are the federal standards/national departure points too high? If yes, why is this a problem? Are they too low? If yes, why is this a problem?)

4. How have SDAs been affected by the changes over time in the levels at which the national standards have been set? What are the positive and/or negative impacts of these changes? How have state policies or practices (e.g. for adjustments to SDA standards) been affected by the changes in national numeric performance standards?

* 5. Do you have suggestions for changing the numerical levels (national standards or national departure points)?

* 6. How did the state decide whether or not to implement additional state performance standards? What standards were considered? What is the intent of any state performance standards that have been implemented? How important does the state consider them to be, compared to the federal standards? Would you like to see them adopted as federal standards?

7. How do the state-initiated standards influence SDA behavior? Do they influence who is selected to receive JTPA services? Do they influence what types of services are provided? Do they influence the cost of JTPA services? Are these effects intentional or unintentional effects of the state standards?

* 8. What do you think was the federal intention behind the development of the local adjustment models? How effective have the models been in achieving these aims in practice? Is it a good idea to have

tolerance ranges defined around the model-derived numerical standards?

* 9. How did the state make the decision to use or not to use the DOL adjustment model?

(Probe: what alternatives were considered?)

10. Do you think the local adjustment models are able to respond to changes in program emphasis over time? What are the problems, if any, that arise, because the models are based on data generated two years earlier?

11. Please describe shortcomings of particular local adjustment models, based on your experience. Have you developed any further adjustments to overcome these problems?

12. Have federal changes to refine the local adjustment models from year to year been helpful or disruptive?

* 13. How did the state develop its policy regarding SDA requests for adjustments to the model-derived standards? What is that policy?

(Probe: whether and on what basis adjustments can be requested; who makes the decision about granting adjustments; whether the state considered granting adjustments for serving especially difficult clients)

14. What has been the frequency of case by case adjustments?

(Probe: on what basis have adjustments been made? in response to what special circumstances? with what effect on numerical performance standards?)

What is the relevant history for the case study SDAs?

* 15. Other than developing additional state performance standards, what policies has the state developed regarding services to hard-to-serve individuals and groups?

(Probe: has the state set aside discretionary funds to promote projects for hard-to-serve clients? does the state have a stated policy for SDAs to target hard-to-serve groups, or give priority to hard-to-serve individuals? has the state encouraged SDAs to provide services to address basic skills deficiencies among adults?)

* 16. What policies or procedures has the state implemented to ensure equitable service to significant population segments (e.g. age groupings, sex groupings, racial groups) as well as groups explicitly mentioned in the JTPA legislation (WIN registrants and high school dropouts)? How are these policies enforced? What are the consequences for an SDA that fails to meet these policies?

* 17. What messages for SDAs did the state try to build into its incentive allocation policy?

(E.g. which performance standards are most important? how bad is it to fail to meet a particular standard? how good is it to "overachieve" on a particular standard? if you can't meet all the standards, how should you make the best of limited resources? etc. etc.)

What are the minimal requirements that any SDA must meet to qualify for an award? How would an SDA maximize its rewards?

18. To what extent is state policy and practice constrained by federal guidelines on the use of the 6% incentive funds?

(e.g. that rewards must be based on exceeding rather than meeting standards; that failure to meet standards for two consecutive years is grounds for reorganization; that projects using incentive funds should be themselves included within the cost limitations and performance standards monitoring system)

What changes would you make in federal policy if you could and why would you make these changes?

19. What has the state's experience been in terms of the actual performance levels achieved by its SDAs?

(Probe: How were incentives allocated in response to PY86 performance? Did some SDAs fail to receive any incentive award? What was the smallest award? the largest award?)

Have there been any unintended effects of the incentive design? Is the state considering any changes to the incentive design for the future?

* 20. What is the intent behind the state's sanctioning policy? What is the state's response to various levels of failure to meet performance standards?

(Probe: what is the level at which the SDA must develop a plan to address a performance problem; what is the level at which the SDA must be reorganized?)

What has been the state's experience in addressing problems of underperformance among its SDAs?

* 21. What is the state's philosophy of technical assistance to SDAs in relation to SDA performance?

(Probe: preventive technical assistance versus response to performance problems after they arise; technical assistance as a positive experience versus as a punishment; extent of state role in delivering the technical assistance)

22. What types of technical assistance have been provided by the state or the federal government to SDAs in the following areas:
    - o reporting requirements
    - o performance standards and the DOL model
    - o state incentives and sanctions policy
    - o how to target the hard-to-serve
    - o how to design innovative and/or effective service programs
    - o how to design service provider contracts
    - o how to collect follow-up data
    - o other topics

    What types of technical assistance have been most well received by SDAs?

* 23. What do you think is the federal intention behind the introduction of the planned post-program performance standards?

24. What is your impression of the likely effect of introducing post-program standards? How is required post-program reporting currently influencing SDA behavior? What are the potential problems with the planned post-program standards? What are the benefits of the planned post-program standards?

* 25. What role has the state played in the development or refinement of YEC systems within the state?

(Probe: what is the level of YEC development within the state? what does the State see as its appropriate role in the process of implementing YEC reporting systems and YEC service delivery systems?)

What can be done to improve the meaningfulness of the YEC part of the performance standards?

D. STATE VIEWS ON OTHER FEDERAL POLICIES AFFECTING THE JTPA SYSTEM

1. How has the federal limit on administrative expenditures influenced state policies and practices? How has it influenced SDA behavior? How has it affected who gets served by the program and what services are offered? Have you learned how to live with this federal regulation? How would you change it if you could redesign federal policy?

2. How has the federal limit on supportive services costs influenced state policies and practices? How has it influenced SDA behavior? How has it affected who gets served by the program and what services are offered?

(Probe: Have you learned to live with this federal regulation? How would you change it if you could redesign federal policy? Do you have any experience requesting waivers to supportive service cost limits?)

3. How has the federal requirement for 40% expenditures on youth services influenced state policies and practices? How has it influenced SDA behavior? How has it affected who gets served by the program and what services are offered?

   (Probe: Have you learned to live with this federal regulation? How would you change it if you could redesign federal policy? Do you have any experience requesting adjustments to the 40% youth expenditure requirement?)

4. How are you affected by federal reporting requirements for client-level outcomes and model factors?...for expenditure data?...for post-program outcome data? Have JTPA data collection requirements influenced state or local program design decisions? Are data collection requirements unnecessarily burdensome? [see also q. E1 below.]

5. What are the problems, if any, with the data required by the federal government? What are your concerns about data accuracy, consistency of definitions, adequacy of model factors, followup data collection practices? What changes would you make in data collection practices if you could? [see also q. E2 below.]

E. OTHER STATE POLICIES AFFECTING THE JTPA SYSTEM

1. What additional reporting requirements has the state imposed beyond those required by the federal government? What was the reason for these additional data elements? What has been their effect on SDA behavior? Have they had any noticeable impact on the types of services offered by SDAs or on the types of clients served?

2. What has been the state role in designing and/or maintaining a state-wide JTPA MIS system? What effect has this had on:

   - o the frequency of feedback on SDA performance to the SDAs;
   - o the frequency of feedback on SDA performance to the state;
   - o the state's ability to monitor who is receiving JTPA services;
   - o the SDA's ability to monitor who is receiving JTPA services;
   - o the frequency of SDA feedback on provider performance;
   - o the ability of the state and/or SDA to request ad hoc reports analyzing performance to date.

3. What is the state's philosophy about monitoring SDA performance during the year?

   (Probe: what is the frequency of on-site monitoring visits? what types of reviews are made at an on-site visit? what interim performance statistics are monitored by the state? what types of notification or corrective action are requested, if any, before the end of the year?)

4. What are the state's policies regarding expenditure rates by its SDAs? Are funds reallocated if they are not spent? Have low expenditure rates been a problem for the state? How have state policies influenced SDA behavior?

5. Has the state developed a policy regarding the proper form and content for a performance-based contract between an SDA and its service providers? Have there been any abuses in the performance-based contracts that have been developed by SDAs in the state? How have state policies in this area influenced SDA behavior?

   (Probe: what are desirable features of a performance-based contract, according to the state? what are undesirable features of a performance-based contract?)

6. How is state policy and practice affected by federal auditing practices and recent developments in federal policies about appropriate unit price contracting practices? How are SDAs affected by these policies?

   (Probe: How do federal policies in this area influence who is served by the program and what services are offered? What changes would you make in federal policy if you could and why would you make these changes?)

* 7. What are state goals and objectives regarding coordinating JTPA 78% resources with resources from other JTPA pools, and other programs? What coordination efforts have actually been implemented? How have these coordination efforts influenced the types of participants enrolling in JTPA programs, or the types of services that have been offered with JTPA funds?

8. To what extent is the state JTPA program influenced by state-initiated welfare reform measures? How have state designed welfare reduction initiatives influenced the types of services offered by SDAs? How have state designed welfare initiatives influenced the types of clients served by SDAs?

9. How are state JTPA policies and practices influenced by federal policies and congressional concerns regarding welfare reduction, including draft legislation for a variety of work/welfare reforms?

   (Probe: Is this influencing who is being served by the JTPA program and what services are being provided?)

   Do you anticipate closer ties in the future between JTPA programs and welfare reform objectives?

F. STATE REACTIONS TO SDA PERFORMANCE IN PY 1986

* 1. What do you think of the range of SDA performance in your state during PY1986? What changes would you like to see in SDA performance in the future (in terms of individual SDAs or state averages)?

* 2. What do you think about the range of services that were provided by SDAs in your state in PY1986? What changes would you like to see in service patterns in the future?

* 3. What do you think about the intensity of services provided by the SDAs in your state during PY1986? What changes would you like to see in the intensity of services in the future?

* 4. What do you think about the patterns of individuals who received services across the SDAs in your state during PY1986? What changes would you like to see in who gets served in the future?

* 5. For each of the above desired changes, will performance standards help or hinder the state in trying to encourage SDAs to make these changes?

OUTLINE OF TOPICS FOR ON-SITE DISCUSSIONS: SDA RESPONDENTS
QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

Ask: Name of Respondent Title Previous Experience with CETA Length of Job Experience with SDA Extent of Involvement with Performance Standards

Outline of Topics for On-Site Discussions: SDA Respondents
Qualitative Analysis

	SDA Administrators (Director, Deputy Director)	Chief Planner, Program Development Staff	SDA Intake Director	Service Provider Monitors	Evaluation Staff, MIS Staff	Fiscal Officer
A. SDA Goals, Objectives, Priorities						
1. The Roles of Different Local Actors	X	X				
What are the roles and concerns of: • PIC members • Local elected officials • SDA staff Specifically what is their interest in policies on priority clients, service design, contractor performance requirements, strategies to maximize SDA rewards. What is their involvement in operationalizing client selection, contractor selection, contractor monitoring, assessing SDA performance.						
2. The Effects of Local Factors on SDA Performance Objectives and Practices						
Size and Characteristics of JTPA Eligible Pool and Applicant Pool	X	X			X	
Types of Local Job Opportunities • Types of Jobs • Stability of Employment • Wage Scales						
Geographic Size of SDA						
Level of SDA's $ Allocation						
Organized Political Influence or On Behalf of Particular Constituencies (e.g., various ethnic groups, welfare recipients, non-English speaking, disabled)						

	SDA Administrators (Director, Deputy Director)	Chief Planner, Program Development Staff	SDA Intake Director	Service Provider Monitors	Evaluation Staff, MIS Staff	Fiscal Officer
A. 2. (continued)						
For each of the topics, the questions are: • How has this factor influenced the design and evolution of SDA performance objectives • How has this factor influenced SDA or service provider actions that affect clients served, services provided, or service costs						
3. **Summary Views on Performance Standards** Overall, how useful are the performance standards as measures of desired performance. Do the planned post-program standards represent an improvement over termination-based standards. Overall, how have the performance standards affected perceptions of the JTPA program by PICs, local elected officials, service providers, and the general public.	X	X			X	
4. **SDA Goals on Clients Served** Does the SDA have priorities for serving individuals with particular characteristics or members of particular target groups. How did you decide what the priorities were (e.g., PIC concerns, state requirements, local need assessment). Have priority groups changed from year to year. What are the hardest types of clients to serve under JTPA. What are the barriers to serving them. What are your strategies, if any, for serving clients perceived as "hard to serve." What was the role of performance standards in the development of SDA goals on clients served. Specifically, how did the welfare entered employment standard influence SDA goals on service to welfare recipients.	X	X	X		X	

	SDA Administrators (Director, Deputy Director)	Chief Planner, Program Development Staff	SDA Intake Director	Service Provider Monitors	Evaluation Staff, MIS Staff	Fiscal Officer
A. 4. (continued)						
How did other federal or state policies influence the development of SDA policies on clients served.						
How were SDA client priorities communicated to service providers.						
5. SDA Goals on Service Design	X	X		X		
What is the SDA's plan for allocating resources across different types of services, and how was it determined.						
Are certain types of services emphasized. Are others excluded.						
What was the role of performance standards in the development of SDA goals on service design.						
How did other federal or state policies influence the development of SDA goals on service design.						
How did the development of joint funding linkages with other funding sources influence the development of SDA goals on service design.						
6. SDA Development of YEC System	X	X		X		
Does the SDA have YEC system in place.						
What types of YEC categories were used.						
How is deficiency defined. How is goal achievement defined.						
How was the choice of YEC made.						
What was the role of the PIC and other groups.						
What was the role of performance standards in developing YECs.						

	SDA Administrators (Director, Deputy Director)	Chief Planner, Program Development Staff	SDA Intake Director	Service Provider Monitors	Evaluation Staff, MIS Staff	Fiscal Officer
A. (continued)						
7. **SDA Suggestions for Improving the YEC System** Changing the number of YECs Changing the Way Deficits or Accomplishment is Measured on Each YEC Changing the Number of YECs that Must Be Achieved Other	X	X		X	X	
B. **Development of SDA Performance Objectives**	X	X		X	X	
* 1. **SDA Performance Objectives** What are SDA priorities and objectives regarding: • relative importance of the different standards. • the importance of maximizing financial rewards. • desired performance levels on each standards and how arrived at (e.g., in comparison to last year, in comparison to this year, in comparison to model-adjusted standards, in comparison to the national standard, in comparison to other SDAs). How did local employer needs influence SDA performance objectives. Do you have local performance goals that are not adequately reflected by the federal or state performance standards. Does the SDA place different priority on the standards than does the state (as reflected in the incentive awards). What are the trade-offs among performance standards (i.e. areas where improving performance on one measure tends to impede performance on another measure). What is your strategy for resolving trade-offs among performance areas.						

	SDA Administrators (Director, Deputy Director)	Chief Planner, Program Development Staff	SDA Intake Director	Service Provider Monitors	Evaluation Staff, MIS Staff	Fiscal Officer

B. 1. (continued)

How much do each of the following influence SDA behavior:
- maximizing SDA funding allocations through maximizing rewards
- avoiding sanctions
- furthering the SDA's own priorities about performance
- achieving or maintaining good community perception of the program

How do these different incentives <u>differ</u> in how they affect SDA behavior.

Is there a conscious relationship between the SDA's performance objectives and:
- its policies or goals on priority client groups.
- its policies or plans for design of its service programs.
- its practices for assigning clients to particular services.
- its practices for selecting and monitoring service providers.
- the terms of its service provider contracts.

What does the SDA do to monitor its own performance during each program year.

What mid-course corrections are made, if any, if performance levels appear to be below the desired levels.

What do you think about your actual PY 86 performance levels. What changes would you like to see in the future.

What do you think about the range of services you provided in PY 1986. What changes would you like to see in the pattern of services provided in the future.

What do you think about who you served in PY 1986. What changes would you like to see in who is served in the future.

For the above, how will the performance standards constrain you, if at all, in making the desired changes.

	SDA Administrators (Director, Deputy Director)	Chief Planner, Program Development Staff	SDA Intake Director	Service Provider Monitors	Evaluation Staff, MIS Staff	Fiscal Officer
B. (continued)						
* 2. SDA Strategies for Improving Performance from Year to Year • If the SDA has had difficulty (or were to have difficulty) meeting one or more performance objectives, what was (would be) their strategy for improving performance. • How did (would) this affect the SDA designs for client selection, services offered, types of providers, provider contractual arrangements. • What impact will the implementation of follow-up standards have on SDA performance strategies in the future.	X	X		X	X	
C. SDA Policies and Practices for Program Implementation		X	X			
1. Describe the flow of clients, and SDA versus contractor responsibilities for: assessment, eligibility determination, enrollment, assignment to services, placement, termination.						
2. Practices Affecting Client Selection		X	X			
What are SDA policies and practices regarding client outreach: • Who does outreach. • Do some or all providers do their own outreach. • What methods are used. • Is special outreach used to generate applications from specific types of applicants (e.g., youth, adults, more qualified, less qualified).						
What are SDA policies and practices regarding client intake: • Who is responsible for intake. • What are intake criteria and procedures. • Who is excluded from participating and for what reasons (basic educational deficiencies, motivation, particular aptitudes, too job ready).			X	X		
What are practices regarding enrollment: • What pre-enrollment activities are available.						

	SDA Administrators (Director, Deputy Director)	Chief Planner, Program Development Staff	SDA Intake Director	Service Provider Monitors	Evaluation Staff, MIS Staff	Fiscal Officer
C. 2. (continued)						
• Do these activities vary by type of client, type of service received (e.g., classroom training versus OJT). • What happens to early dropouts from various components.						
Is there a conscious relationship between enrollment practices and SDA client service priorities.	X	X	X		X	
What are SDA policies and practices regarding assignment to services (i.e., matching clients to services): • How is a client assigned to a particular service. • What is the effect of space availability, client interest, client performance on pre-enrollment tests. • Are clients ever assigned to multiple services.		X	X	X		
Is there a conscious relationship between assignment to service practices and SDA service design goals.	X	X	X		X	
Is there a conscious relationship between assignment to service practices and SDA performance objectives.	X	X	X		X	
How much variation has there been from year to year in SDA policies and practices regarding client outreach, intake, and enrollment in service.	X	X		X		
• What impact has the existence of performance standards had on the design and evolution of these policies and practices.						
3. **Practices Affecting Services Delivered**						
In advertising for/selecting service providers, what specifications does the SDA make regarding: • what types of services shall be offered (including supportive services).	X	X				X

E-67

	SDA Administrators (Director, Deputy Director)	Chief Planner, Program Development Staff	SDA Intake Director	Service Provider Monitors	Evaluation Staff, MIS Staff	Fiscal Officer
C. 3. (continued)						
• the specific content of services. • the expected duration of services. • the expected sequencing of services. • the volume of clients to be enrolled in each type of service.						
Describe the range of youth and adult services to be provided according to SDA funding announcements (including % in-school youth; % out-of-school youth programming).	X	X			X	X
How much variation has there been over time in the overall service design since the beginning of JTPA. How much difference from CETA.						
Are direct placements permitted. Encouraged. Discouraged.						
* What impact has the existence of performance standards had on the design and evolution of the SDA's practices for offering services.						
4. Practices Affecting Types of Service Providers and Regulation of Provider Performance						
How are providers recruited and selected: • How many contracts are there. • How are contracts differentiated (e.g., by service, by client, type, by geographic area). • What is the mix of organizational types of providers (e.g., public educational institutions, other public agencies, community-based agencies)	X	X				X
Are contractors selected through a competitive bid process. • How competitive is the selection process. • Do the same providers tend to apply each year. • Are there service providers who have stopped bidding or whose contracts have not been renewed.						
How many of the current providers were also service providers under CETA.						

	SDA Administrators (Director, Deputy Director)	Chief Planner, Program Development Staff	SDA Intake Director	Service Provider Monitors	Evaluation Staff, MIS Staff	Fiscal Officer
C. 4. (continued)						
How are contracts negotiated (who participates in decisions about contract terms, what contract conditions are of most concern to SDAs)						
What do contracts require regarding: • different performance payment points (e.g., enrollment, completions, entered employment, training-related placements, retained employment for "X" period) • minimum required performance levels • consequences of failure to meet minimum levels • compensation rate for each payment point • bonuses for high performance • required client characteristics • consequences of failure to meet required characteristics	X	X		X	X	
How do these contractual requirements vary • by provider • by type of service offered • by type of participant to be served (do any provisions vary for "hard to serve" participants)				X		X
How do these contractual arrangements relate to SDA client service priorities.	X	X		X		
How do these contract requirements relate to the SDA's own numerical performance standards.						
What are SDA monitoring practices regarding: • frequency • relation to contractual requirements • attention to interim underperformance problems				X		
How has actual provider performance measured up on contractual requirements in the past.	X			X	X	
What have been the consequences for underperformers. For high performers.	X	X		X		

	SDA Administrators (Director, Deputy Director)	Chief Planner, Program Development Staff	SDA Intake Director	Service Provider Monitors	Evaluation Staff, MIS Staff	Fiscal Officer
C. 4. (continued)						
What is your opinion about:						
• the advantages and/or disadvantages of performance-based contracting.	X	X		X	X	
• how SDA contractual requirements and monitoring procedures have influenced service provider actions that affect clients selected, services provided, or service costs.						
• whether there has been a learning curve that will make future effects different from the past.						
What impact has the existence of performance standards had on the evolution of the SDA's practices for selecting service providers and designing service contracts.	X	X		X		X
5. SDA Practices and Procedures Regarding Placement and Termination		X			X	
How is placement defined for payment to providers.						
How is placement defined for reporting on JASR.						
Who is responsible for placing individuals on completion of training.						
When does termination from JTPA occur.		X		X	X	
What are the follow-up responsibilities of service provider versus SDA.						
What impact has the existence of performance standards had on SDA practices and procedures regarding placement and termination.						
Is there any conscious relationship between placement and termination procedures and SDA performance objectives.						

	SDA Administrators (Director, Deputy Director)	Chief Planner, Program Development Staff	SDA Intake Director	Service Provider Monitors	Evaluation Staff, MIS Staff	Fiscal Officer
D. Understanding of Federal and State Performance Standards Policies						
1. The Choice of Additional State Performance Standards	X	X		X	X	
How do you understand: • the intention of the state standards • the intended relative emphasis on federal standards versus state standards • the influence of additional state standards on SDA actions that affect clients served, services provided, or service costs • whether there are any unintended effects of additional state standards Do you have any suggestions for changing the number of/content of federal or state standards.						
2. State Alterations to/Exceptions to the Local Adjustment Models	X	X			X	
How do you understand: • the intention of state adjustments to the model • SDA experience with these alterations or adjustments • the influence of these adjustments on SDA actions that affect clients served, services provided, or service costs • whether there have been any unintended effects What has been your experience with requesting a special adjustment because of unique or unusual circumstances What further improvements could be made to the models						
3. State Design of the Incentive Rewards System						
How do you understand: • the state intent in designing the rewards system • what minimal requirements any SDA must meet to qualify for an award (e.g., certain standards that must be met, a certain number that must be met)	X	X		X	X	

	SDA Administrators (Director, Deputy Director)	Chief Planner, Program Development Staff	SDA Intake Director	Service Provider Monitors	Evaluation Staff, MIS Staff	Fiscal Officer
D. 3. (continued)						
• what formula determines the amount of incentive rewards that each SDA will get • the possible strategies for an SDA to maximize or improve its share of the available rewards • whether the rewards system has influenced SDA actions that affect clients served, services provided, or service costs • whether there have been unintended effects • whether there has been a "learning curve" that will make further effects different from the past What has been your pattern of rewards.						
4. State Sanctioning Actions What has been your experience, if any, in receiving state sanctions. How do you understand: • the intention of state sanctions • what performance levels have been determined to be sanctionable • the influence of sanctions or the threat of sanctions on SDA actions affecting clients served, services provided, or service costs • whether there are any unintended effects • whether there has been a "learning curve" that will make future effects different from the past	X	X				
5. SDA Actions Regarding Utilization of State Rewards for Past Performance How have past rewards been utilized. What are plans for utilizing future rewards. Is there any effort made to pass rewards along to high performing service providers. Is there any effort made to use rewards to increase services to special need populations or fund innovative projects.	X	X		X		

E-72

120

121

	SDA Administrators (Director, Deputy Director)	Chief Planner, Program Development Staff	SDA Intake Director	Service Provider Monitors	Evaluation Staff, MIS Staff	Fiscal Officer
D. 5. (continued)						
Have SDA actions on use of rewards had any influence on service provider actions that affect clients served, services provided, or service costs.						
Has there been a "learning curve" that will make future effects different from the past.						
6. SDA Actions Regarding Receipt of State 6% Funds Set Aside for Hard-to-Serve Clients	X	X		X		
Does the state set aside special funds for hard-to-serve clients.						
How does an SDA go about obtaining these funds -- by performing well on extra state standards, by exceeding required levels of service to hard-to-serve clients.						
Did the SDA compete for/receive any state funds set aside for hard-to-serve clients. Describe any projects utilizing these funds.						
E. The Impact of Other Federal and/or State Policies on SDA Policies and Practices						
1. Federal Limitation on Supportive Services Costs	X	X		X		
2. Federal Limitation on Administrative Expenditures	X	X		X		
3. Federal Requirement to Spend 40% on Youth	X	X				
4. Federal JTPA Reporting Requirements						
• Related to client-level termination outcomes and model factors	X				X	
• Related to expenditures	X				X	X
• Related to post-program outcomes	X				X	
5. Regulations on Use of 6% Funds	X	X		X		
6. Federal JTPA Auditing Practices	X					X

	SDA Administrators (Director, Deputy Director)	Chief Planner, Program Development Staff	SDA Intake Director	Service Provider Monitors	Evaluation Staff, MIS Staff	Fiscal Officer
E. (continued)						
7. Federal Technical Assistance on (1) the Performance Standards; (2) Developing Youth Competency Systems; (3) Implementing Innovative Service Programs	X	X			X	
8. Other Federal Influences such as Federal Welfare Reduction Initiatives; Perceived Congressional Concerns	X	X			X	
9. Any Additional State Reporting Requirements	X				X	
10. SDA Opinion About the Adequacy of JTPA Reporting Requirements						
• concerns about data consistency: definitions/ data collection practices • concerns about burden: total cost and staff effort • concerns about the adequacy of measuring model adjustment factors • concerns about the adequacy of follow-up data collection practices and/or data elements • perceptions about YEC reporting practices • suggestions for improving reporting requirements or practices	X	X		X	X	X
11. State Role in Designing/Monitoring MIS: • client level termination data and model factors • expenditure data, expenditure rates • post-program/follow-up data	X				X	X
12. State Monitoring Procedures: • frequency • emphasis on interim performance • scope of state monitoring	X	X		X	X	
13. State Goals for Service to Significant Segments or Equitable Service Provision to Dropouts and WIN Registrants	X	X	X			
14. Existence of State Policy to Rescind and Reallocate Unexpended SDA Funds	X					X
15. State Policies Regulating Performance-Based Contracts for JTPA	X			X		X

SDA Topic Outline

	SDA Administrators (Director, Deputy Director)	Chief Planner, Program Development Staff	SDA Intake Director	Service Provider Monitors	Evaluation Staff, MIS Staff	Fiscal Officer
E. (continued)						
16. State Technical Assistance on: (1) Performance Standards; (2) Development of Youth Competency Systems; (3) Innovative/Effective Program Design	X	X			X	
17. State Efforts to Coordinate JTPA Title IIA 78% Funds with Other JTPA/Non-JTPA Resources	X	X				X
18. Other State Factors, Such as State Welfare Reduction Initiatives, State Legislature Concerns, etc.	X	X				

For topics 1 through 18 above, the questions include:

- how SDAs understand the federal or state intentions implementing these policies or undertaking these actions;
- whether they have influenced SDA actions that affect clients served, services provided, or service costs;
- whether they have had any unintended effects;
- whether there has been a "learning curve" that will make future effects different from the past.

OUTLINE OF TOPICS FOR ON-SITE DISCUSSIONS: PIC REPRESENTATIVE
QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

OUTLINE OF TOPICS FOR ON-SITE DISCUSSIONS: PIC REPRESENTATIVE QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

1. **The Role of the PIC**

   What are the primary concerns of PIC members?

   Specifically, what is their interest in policies on priority clients, service design, contractor performance requirements, strategies to maximize SDA rewards.

   What is their involvement in operationalizing client selection, contractor selection, contractor monitoring, assessing SDA performance.

2. **SDA Goals on Clients Served**

   Does the SDA have priorities for serving individuals with particular characteristics or members of particular target groups.

   Have priority groups changes from year to year.

   Is there a conscious relationship between the SDA's priority client groups and its performance objectives. What is the influence of the state incentive policy.

   What role does the PIC play in establishing these priorities.

3. **SDA Goals on Service Design**

   What is the SDA's plan for allocating resources across different types of services, and how was it determined.

   Are certain types of services emphasized. Are others excluded.

   Is there a conscious relationship between the SDA's program design and its performance objectives. What is the influence of the state incentive policy.

   What role does the PIC play in the development of the SDA's service design.

4. **SDA Development of YEC System**

   Does the SDA have YEC system in place.

   What types of YEC categories were used.

   How was the choice of YEC made.

4. (continued)

What was the role of the PIC and other groups.

What was the role of performance standards in developing YECs.

5. **SDA Performance Objectives**

What are SDA priorities and objectives regarding:
- relative importance of the different standards.
- the importance of maximizing financial rewards.
- desired performance levels on each standard and how arrived at (e.g., in comparison to last year, in comparison to this year, in comparison to model-adjusted standards, in comparison to the national standard, in comparison to other SDAs).

How did the local employer needs influence SDA performance objectives.

Do you have local performance goals that are not adequately reflected by the federal or state performance standards.

Does the SDA place different priority on the standards than does the state (as reflected in the incentive awards).

6. **PIC Opinion About Performance**

What do you think about SDA performance in PY86. What change has there been over time. What changes would you like to see in the future.

What do you think about who was served in PY86. What changes would you like to see in who is served.

What do you think about the range of services provided in your SDA in PY86. What changes would you like to see in service provision, the types of providers, or provider contractual arrangements?

For all of the above, how would performance standards constrain you in making the desired changes.

7. **Summary Views of Performance Standards**

Overall, how useful are the performance standards as measures of desired performance.

Do the planned post-program standards represent an improvement over the termination-based standards.

7. (continued)

Do you think that the public, including local elected officials and employers, has a different image of JTPA than it had of CETA.

If so, how much do you think the change of image has to do with performance standards, and how much with other changes that were instituted at the same time (e.g., shift to private sector orientation, prohibition of public service employment, limitation on stipends, etc.). What specific changes in public perception have resulted from the performance standards.

OUTLINE OF TOPICS FOR ON-SITE DISCUSSIONS: SERVICE PROVIDERS
QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

OUTLINE OF TOPICS FOR ON-SITE DISCUSSIONS: SERVICE PROVIDERS
QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

A. **History of Service Provider as an Employment Services Contractor**

1. **History of Organization as Service Provider for CETA/JTPA**

- Organizational goals and objectives
  -- Larger organizational mandate
- Number of years experience as a provider
  -- Reason for participating in JTPA as service provider
- Range of services provided under JTPA
- Previous experience with special target groups, if any
- Other funding sources and service contracts
  -- How does JTPA fit into larger organizational goals, management practices

2. **Range of Services Currently Provided Under JTPA Contract**

- Number of different service sites
- Number of distinct contracts with SDA
- Number of distinct training curricula, services
- Scale of different service components (enrollment)

3. **Experience Bidding for and Negotiating Service Contract with SDA**

- How much competition do you think there was for this contract in PY1986

- What is the service provider's perception about what critera were used to select contractors:
  -- proposed costs
  -- experience in operating programs
  -- specific service design
  -- community orientation
  -- type of provider
  -- commitment to hard-to-serve clients

- Does the service provider in turn subcontract with any other organizations
  -- how are they selected
  -- what are their responsibilities/contract payment terms

B. **Contractual Relationships/Relative Roles of SDA and Service Provider**

1. **Contract Requirements**

How was the contract negotiated (what actors, how much discussion, about what points)

B.1. (continued)

What did PY1986 contracts require regarding:

- different performance payment points (e.g. enrollment, completions, entered employment, training-related placements, retained employment for "x" period)
- minimum required performance levels
- achievement of YECs
- consequences of failure to meet minimum levels
- compensation rate for each payment point
- bonuses for high performance
- required client characteristics
- consequences of failure to meet required characteristics

How did these contractual requirements vary:

- by type of client
- by type of service.

If not performance based, what were reimbursement arrangements.

Have contractual requirements changed over time for this service provider (what were the reasons for changes in contract terms).

What does provider think about the advantages and/or disadvantages of performance based contracting.

What changes would service provider like to make in contractual requirements and why.

2. **Description of SDA Monitoring Activities**

Describe SDA monitoring activities:

- frequency
- relation to contractual requirements
- attention to interim problems of under-performance
- requests for corrective action

3. **Description of SDA Reporting Requirements**

What requirements has the SDA imposed for reporting:

- applicant characteristics
- client characteristics
- attendance
- termination outcomes
- follow-up outcomes
- reporting on YEC outcomes

B. (continued)

4. **Provider Opinion about Adequacy of Reporting Requirements**

- concerns about data consistency: definitions and practices (e.g., definitions of enrollment, placement, termination)
- concerns about burden of data collection
- concerns about the adequacy of adjustments for client characteristics
- concerns about the adequacy of follow-up data collection practices
- suggestions for improving reporting requirements or practices

C. **Service Provider Priorities, Incentives, and Policies**

1. **Factors Influencing Provider Behavior**

What is the relative importance to the service provider of:

- the agency's own priorities
- SDA contractual requirements
- state or federal performance standards facing the SDA.

Which of the following outcomes are the most effective determinants of service provider behavior:

- immediate compensation
- future contracting opportunities
- community perception of provider performance
- provider's own priorities, or those of parent organization

How do these different incentives <u>differ</u> in how they affect service provider behavior (e.g., program design or client selection decisions)

2. **Service Provider Performance Objectives**

What is the relative importance to you of the different performance requirements in your contract.

What is your desired performance on each requirement (e.g. to meet the requirement, to exceed the requirement).

What are the tradeoffs among performance dimensions (i.e. areas where improving performance on one measure tends to impede performance on another measure).

C.2. (continued)

What is your strategy for resolving trade-offs among performance areas.

What has your past experience been, in terms of meeting or not meeting your performance requirements.

What has been the result of past failures to meet performance requirements.

What has been the result (benefits, rewards) of past experience in performing well, compared to your contract requirements or compared to other service providers.

If you were to have difficulty in the future in meeting your contractual requirements, what would your strategy be for improving your performance (what effect would it have on who you serve, what services you offer, and the duration or cost of services).

In PY1986, how well did you do on each of the performance requirements in your contract.

What do you think about your PY1986 performance level. What changes would you like to see in your performance in the future.

What do you think about the range of services you provided in PY1986. What changes would you like to see in the pattern of services provided in the future.

What do you think about who you served in PY1986. What changes would you like to see in who is served in the future.

For all the above, how would your performance requirements constrain you in making the desired changes.

3. **Effect on Service Provider of SDA Policies Related to the Performance Standards**

How familiar is the service provider with the seven federal performance standards and any additional state standards, and with the numerical standards set for the SDA.

Which performance standards does the SDA think are the most important. Does the service provider agree with this order of priorities.

C.3. (continued)

How does the SDA communicate its performance priorities to its service providers:

- through general policy statements
- through actual contract requirements
- through a payment schedule that offers bonuses for higher performance levels.

How do the numerical contract requirements established for each service provider relate to the actual numerical performance standards set for the SDA as a whole.

How do the SDA's performance goals, as communicated to its service providers, influence service provider practices, such as client outreach, client selection, assignment to services, design of service content or duration, placement strategies.

D. Description of Service Provider Practices

1. Describe Service Provider Practices Regarding Client Outreach.

- Is special outreach used to generate applications from specific types of applicants (e.g.youth, adults, more qualified applicants, more difficult to serve clients)

2. Describe Service Provider Practices Regarding Client Assessment, Selection, Enrollment, Assignment to Services, Provision of Supportive Services

- What criteria are used to select from among JTPA-eligible applicants -- are employer identified (pre-approved) referrals made for on-the-job placement slots

- How do the number of eligible applicants compare to the available number of training slots. Is a waiting list used.

- What assessment tests are used by the service provider. How are the results of these tests used to determine who is admitted; who is not accepted; what services will be offered to an applicant.

- What are examples of the reasons for discouraging/excluding an applicant from participating (e.g. basic educational deficiencies, motivational deficiencies, lack of particular aptitudes, too job ready, insufficient supportive services available, lack of transportation).

- When does enrollment occur, and who enrolls clients.

D.2. (continued)

- How is a client assigned to a particular service. How frequently are clients enrolled into two services simultaneously. How frequently are plans made to enroll clients into two services sequentially.

- What kinds of supportive services are available -- problems/issues associated with supportive services/lack of stipends.

3. **Describe Placement, Termination and Follow-up Practices**

- How is placement defined, for the purpose of reports to the SDA.

- Does the definition of placement differ by type of service.

- How is placement defined, for the purpose of payment schedules.

- What is the extent of the responsibility of the service provider in the placement process. Are there other service contractors who specialize in job placement.

- What is the extent of service provider responsibility to provide follow-up services to the client (including 30, 60, 90 day contracts if service related)

- What is the extent of service provider responsibility to generate follow-up data for reporting purposes.
  -- for SDA
  -- as part formal post-termination reporting required by DOL

- When are clients terminated by the service provider.

- When are clients terminated by the SDA.

E. **Effect on Service Provider of SDA Policies Regarding Client Priorities and Client Selection**

1. Does the SDA have priorities for serving individuals with particular characteristics or members of particular target groups.

- Does the service provider agree with these priorities.

- Does the service provider have priority groups of its own that differ or supplement the SDA's priority groups.

2. How are the SDA client priority groups communicated to service providers, and how do they affect the expectations placed on particular providers:

E.2. (continued)

- through general policy statements
- through contractual requirements
- through a payment schedule that offers bonuses or a higher rate for services to more difficult clients
- other

3. Have the SDA's priority client groupings changed from year to year. If so, how.

4. How do the SDA's client priorities, as communicated to its service providers, influence service provider activities, such as client outreach, client assessment, client selection, assignment to service, design of service content and duration, placement strategies.

5. What is the service provider's opinion about who are the hardest clients to serve under JTPA. What are the barriers to serving them. What are the service provider's strategies, if any for serving clients perceived as "hard to serve".

F. Effect on Service Providers of SDA Policies Regarding Service Design and Assignment to Service Issues

1. What is the SDA's plan for allocating resources across different types of services

2. Does the service provider agree with the SDA's emphases among different types of services (e.g., adult versus youth services; classroom training versus on-the-job training; in-school youth programming versus out of school youth programming; pre-employment preparation versus training versus job search and placement services). Does the service provider think other services are important that are not emphasized by the SDA.

3. How are the SDA's service priorities communicated to service providers, and how do they affect the services offered by specific providers:

- through general policy statements
- through specific contract requirements
- through a payment schedule that offers different rates for the provision of different kinds of services.

F. (continued)

4. How do the SDA's service priorities, as communicated to its service providers, influence service provider activities, such as client outreach, client assessment, client selection, assignment to services, design of service content or duration, or placement strategies.

5. Are providers encouraged to/discouraged from making service referrals to link clients to additional needed services.

G. **Effect on Service Providers of SDA Policies Regarding Acceptable Service Costs**

1. How does the SDA specify the acceptable range of service costs per enrollee or per placement
   -- in RFPs announcing available funds
   -- in contract negotiations
   -- in unit price rates

2. How do the acceptable cost ranges vary
   -- for different types of services
   -- for different types of clients
   -- for different types of providers

3. Does the service provider think that the available cost guidelines set by the SDA are reasonable. What changes would the service provider like to see in cost guidelines. What difference would this make in service content or client selection practices?

H. **Issues Relating to Youth Competency Areas** (For Providers Serving Youth)

1. What are the YEC outcomes used for your program in particular.

2. How are they applied.

   - What is the operational definition of a deficiency in each area.

   - What is the operational definition of obtaining a competency in each area.

   - How do these relate to your payment points? Do you record YEC outcomes for youth in placement oriented programs?

3. What role did service provider play in developing YECs in your organization.

H. (continued)

4. What are your concerns about the reporting of YEC outcomes, and how could this system be improved in your SDA.

I. Effects of Local Factors on Service Provider Practices and Performance

1. Size and characteristics of JTPA eligible pool and applicant pool

2. Types of local job opportunities:

   - types of jobs
   - stability of employment
   - wage rates

3. Geographic size of SDA

4. Level of SDA's total dollar allocation

5. Organized political influence of or on behalf of particular constituencies (e.g. various ethnic groups, welfare recipients, non-English speaking, disabled).

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1988 O - 223-604